Library of
Central Baptist Theological Seminary

Classification Accession

Gift
Purchase
Date

Central BAPTIST
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

Papers

of the

American Society of Church History

Second Series

Volume VIII

Edited by

Frederick William Loetscher

Secretary

G. P. Putnam's Sons

New York and London

The Knickerbocker Press

1928

COPYRIGHT, 1928
BY
THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY, INC.

270.06
A512

CONTENTS

PAGE

ACT OF INCORPORATION v

CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS vii

MINUTES AND REPORTS OF THE SOCIETY AND THE COUNCIL, 1923–1927 xiii

THE ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT, JAMES COFFIN STOUT, AT THE SEVENTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING: "THE EARLY CHRISTIAN SARCOPHAGI OF THE LATERAN MUSEUM AND THEIR HISTORICAL SUGGESTIVENESS" 1

THE ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT, HENRY JACOB WEBER, AT THE EIGHTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING: "THE FORMAL DIALECTICAL RATIONALISM OF CALVIN" . 17

THE ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT, SHIRLEY JACKSON CASE, AT THE NINETEENTH ANNUAL MEETING: "THE ACCEPTANCE OF CHRISTIANITY BY THE ROMAN EMPERORS" 43

RELIGIOUS AND MORAL CONDITIONS AMONG THE CANADIAN PIONEERS 65
By John T. McNeill

UNIDENTIFIED SERMONS OF SEVERIAN, BISHOP OF GABALA 123
By Herbert T. Weiskotten

LUTHER AND CULTURE 147
By John Alfred Faulkner

CHURCH HISTORICAL RESEARCH AND LIBRARY COOPERATION 169
By Ernest Cushing Richardson

27089

PAGE

PROTESTANTISM IN THE UKRAINE 177
By Basil Kusiw

THE REVEREND JAMES I. GOOD, D.D., AS A CHURCH HISTORIAN 197
By George Warren Richards

THE PRESENT STATUS OF SLAVIC STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY 211
By Matthew Spinka

THE BELLARMINE-JEFFERSON LEGEND AND THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE 237
By David S. Schaff

LIST OF MEMBERS 277

DECEASED MEMBERS 297

STATISTICS OF MEMBERSHIP 301

ACT OF INCORPORATION

LAWS OF NEW YORK

Chap. 82

AN ACT to incorporate The American Society of Church History, Incorporated.

Became a law March 30, 1916, with the approval of the Governor. Passed three-fifths being present.

The People of the State of New York, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

Section 1. John Alfred Faulkner, Edward Payson Johnson, William Walker Rockwell, Henry James Weber, Robert Hastings Nichols, Francis Albert Christie, Joseph Cullen Ayer, junior, James Isaac Good, David Schley Schaff, Henry Bradford Washburn, Frederick William Loetscher, James Coffin Stout, Austin B. Keep, William A. Schwarze, and George Edwin Horr and their successors in office chosen from time to time are hereby incorporated and are declared to be a body corporate of the state of New York by the name of The American Society of Church History, Incorporated, and by such name shall be known and shall have perpetual succession with the powers, limitations and restrictions herein contained.

Section 2. The objects of the corporation shall be to promote and stimulate historical study and research generally, but particularly in the department of church history; to discover, collect and preserve historical manuscripts; to print, publish and cause to be distributed, papers, books, writings, reports, articles and data bearing on or in anywise relating to church history or containing the results of the researches or other activities of its members; to establish and maintain traveling fellowships to carry out or to maintain any of the foregoing purposes;

to hold conventions or meetings of its members; to establish and maintain a library; to establish and maintain endowments for any of the foregoing purposes; to acquire by purchase, gift, devise or otherwise, and to hold real and personal estate so far as may be necessary in carrying out its lawful purposes; and to mortgage, sell, lease or otherwise dispose of any real or personal estate according to law.

Section 3. The corporation hereby created shall have all the powers and be subject to all the restrictions which now or hereafter may pertain by law to membership corporations in so far as the same are applicable to and not inconsistent with the provisions of this act.

Section 4. The acts done by the above named persons on the twenty-seventh day of December, nineteen hundred and fifteen, in adopting by-laws, electing officers and passing resolutions so far as they are consistent with this act are hereby ratified and declared to be valid.

Section 5. This act shall take effect immediately.

CONSTITUTION[1]

ARTICLE I

NAME

Section 1. This corporation shall be known as the AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY.

ARTICLE II

OBJECTS

Section 1. The particular objects for which the corporation is to be formed are: to promote and stimulate historical study and research generally, but particularly in the department of Church History; to discover, collect and preserve historical manuscripts; to print, publish, and cause to be distributed, papers, books, writings, reports, articles and data bearing on or in anywise relating to Church History or containing the results of the researches or other activities of its members; to establish and maintain traveling fellowships to carry out or to maintain any of the foregoing purposes; to hold conventions or meetings of its members; to establish and maintain a library; to establish and maintain endowments for any of the foregoing purposes; to acquire by purchase, gift, devise or otherwise, and to hold real and personal property so far as may be necessary in carrying out its lawful purposes; and to mortgage, sell, lease or otherwise dispose of any real or personal estate according to law.

ARTICLE III

MEMBERS

Section 1. The members of each class shall have equal rights and privileges in the corporation.

[1] Approved by the Council, May 15, 1915, and adopted by the Society, December 27, 1915.

Section 2. Candidates for membership shall be proposed by one member and seconded by another, and shall be elected by the Council. On receipt of an application for membership with proposer and seconder, the Secretary shall send the name of such candidate to each member of the Council and on receipt of letters of approval of such candidate from a majority of the members of the Council, such candidate shall, upon payment of dues for one year,[1] become and be entitled to all the rights and privileges of members of the corporation.

Section 3. All persons interested in Church History shall be eligible to membership.

ARTICLE IV

MANAGEMENT

Section 1. The management of the corporation shall be in the board of directors, which shall be called the Council and which shall consist of the officers enumerated in Article "V" hereof, the ex-Presidents, and two other members to be elected annually. Whenever the number of persons so constituting the Council shall exceed the number of directors permitted by the Charter, then the ex-President who has been longest out of office shall cease automatically to be a member of the Council; and if the number still remaining be greater than permitted, the next ex-President who has been longest out of office shall automatically cease to be a member of the Council. Vacancies in the Council shall be filled by the members thereof until the next annual meeting. Whenever the number of persons so constituting the Council shall be less than the total number required by the Charter, then the number of members elected to the Council at the annual meeting shall be increased so as to make the membership of the Council correspond with the requirements of the Charter.

Section 2. The Council shall have power to suspend or expel members of the corporation for cause and to restore them to

[1] The words, "upon payment of dues for one year," were added to this Section by an amendment adopted by the Society, December 27, 1920.

membership after a suspension or expulsion. No member shall be suspended or expelled without first having been given opportunity to be heard; but the Council shall strike from the roll of membership the name of any member who has failed to pay dues for three years, and thereafter such person shall cease to be a member of the corporation.[1]

Section 3. The property of the corporation shall be vested in, and the affairs of the corporation conducted by, the Council.

Section 4. The Council shall have no power to bind the corporation to any expenditure of money beyond the actual resources of the corporation, except by the consent of every member of the Council expressed in writing.

Section 5. The Council shall be charged with the general interests of the corporation including the election of members, the calling of meetings, the selection of papers, the arrangement of programs, the determination of papers to be published and the auditing of the Treasurer's accounts.

ARTICLE V

OFFICERS

Section 1. The officers of the corporation shall be a President, a Vice-President, a Secretary and a Treasurer, who shall be elected by ballot for the term of one year at the annual meeting of the members. No President shall be elected to succeed himself. Temporary officers shall be chosen by the incorporators to act until the first annual meeting of the members.

Section 2. Vacancies in any office may be filled by the Council.

ARTICLE VI

FEES AND DUES

Section 1. The annual dues for active members shall be Three Dollars; for sustaining members Ten Dollars. On pay-

[1] This Section of Article IV was amended by the Society, December 27, 1920, the amendment consisting in the removal, in the last sentence, of the period after the word "heard" and the addition of the clause now added after that word.

ment of One Hundred Dollars at any one time, any individual member, not a library, may become a life member exempt from dues.

ARTICLE VII

MEETINGS

Section 1. The annual meeting of the members of the corporation shall be held on the last Monday of December of each year. Notice thereof shall be sent by mail to each member at least two weeks prior thereto.

Section 2. Special meetings of the members may be called at any time by the Council.

Section 3. Ten members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business by the corporation, but a smaller number may sit for the purpose of hearing and discussing papers presented.

ARTICLE VIII

SEAL

Section 1. The seal of the corporation shall bear the name of the corporation in Latin, with the date of its foundation, together with an emblematic lamp, and the motto *Christiani nihil a me alienum puto.*

ARTICLE IX

AMENDMENTS

Section 1. This Constitution may be amended by a two-thirds vote of those present at any legally constituted annual meeting, provided that notice of such amendments shall be given in writing at the preceding annual meeting, or the amendment itself shall be approved by the Council before the meeting at which it shall be voted upon.

BY-LAWS[1]

ARTICLE I

MEMBERS AND PUBLICATIONS

Section 1. One copy of each of the publications which are issued after his election shall be sent to each member, who has paid dues at least once and is not in arrears for more than two years; but libraries shall be expected to pay dues only for those years in which the corporation publishes a volume.

ARTICLE II

THE COUNCIL

Section 1. The Council may make such rules for its own government as it may deem wise, but no such rules shall be inconsistent with the By-Laws and Constitution of the corporation. Five members of the Council shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

Section 2. The Council shall hold at least one meeting in each year, when it shall consider and act upon the names of candidates proposed for membership, and shall transact such other business as may legally come before it.

Section 3. The Council shall, at each annual meeting of the corporation, render a full report of its proceedings during the year last past.

ARTICLE III

DUTIES OF OFFICERS

Section 1. The President, or in his absence, the Vice-President, shall preside at all meetings of the Society. In the absence of these officers, the Society may choose a temporary President from the members present.

Section 2. The Secretary shall notify the members, at least two weeks in advance of each meeting; keep the minutes, and

[1] Adopted by the Society, December 27, 1915.

conduct the correspondence of the Society under the direction of the Council. The Secretary may also enroll the name of any library as a member on payment of its dues.

Section 3. The Treasurer shall send bills regularly to all members, take charge of the funds of the Society and invest and disburse them under the direction of the Council.

ARTICLE IV

PROCEDURE

Section 1. The order of business at any annual meeting shall, except when otherwise ordered, be the following:

Call to order.

Reading of minutes of previous annual and of any special meeting.

Annual report of the Council.

Reports of officers and annual reports of committees.

Unfinished business.

Election.

New business, including the reading of the Presidential Address and other papers.

Adjournment.

Section 2. The procedure at annual and special meetings of the corporation and of the annual meetings, where not otherwise provided for in the By-Laws, shall be governed by "Roberts' Rules of Order."

ARTICLE V

AMENDMENTS

Section 1. These By-Laws may be amended at any duly constituted meeting of the corporation by a two-thirds vote of the members present.

THE SEVENTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE SOCIETY, DECEMBER 30, 1923

THE American Society of Church History held its seventeenth annual meeting in the Directors' Room of Union Theological Seminary, Broadway at 120th Street, New York City, on Monday, December 30, 1923.

MORNING SESSION

The meeting was called to order at 10:30 by President James Coffin Stout, and prayer was offered by Dr. Erwin R. Goodenough, of New Haven.

The following members were present: Messrs. J. C. Stout, F. W. Loetscher, E. Emerton, E. P. Johnson, J. M. Kelso, J. A. Faulkner, P. Smith, H. J. Weber, W. N. Schwarze, J. T. McNeill, R. H. Nichols, H. T. Weiskotten, C. H. Lyttle, E. L. Hood. The following guests were also present: H. Dressel, E. R. Goodenough, H. T. Kuist, B. Kusiw, N. Kusiw, D. H. Schroeder, A. B. Rhinow.

The literary session was opened with the Presidential Address by James Coffin Stout, of The Biblical Seminary in New York, New York City, whose subject was *The Christian Sarcophagi of the Lateran Museum at Rome, and Their Historical Significance.* The paper was discussed by the Secretary and Messrs. Emerton, P. Smith, Goodenough, Faulkner, and the author.

The second paper of the morning was by John Thomas McNeill, of Knox College, Toronto, Canada, on the subject,

Religious and Moral Conditions Among the Canadian Pioneers. In the discussion which ensued the following took part: Messrs. Faulkner, Nichols, E. P. Johnson, Hood, Loetscher, and the author.

William Alva Gifford, of the Wesleyan Theological College, Montreal, Canada, was the author of the next paper, which, in his absence, was read by E. P. Johnson, the subject being, *John Wesley as Patriot and Statesman.* Dr. Faulkner and Dr. Lyttle discussed the paper.

At 1:15 the members of the Society and its guests repaired for luncheon to the Faculty Club of Columbia University, 400 117th Street, New York.

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Society reconvened in the Directors' Room of Union Theological Seminary at 3:15, President Stout in the chair.

The following members, in addition to those recorded as present at the morning session, were in attendance: Messrs. Kieffer, Steimle, Scherer.

The Minutes of the last annual meeting, that of December 26, 1922, were read and approved as read.

The Council reported through the Secretary concerning the actions taken by the Council at its afternoon session, and the actions of the Council were approved by the Society.

The recommendations of the Council for officers and members of the standing committees for the ensuing year were approved, the Secretary being instructed to cast a ballot for all the nominees, and the President thereupon declaring the nominees duly elected and appointed to their respective offices. (For the list of officers and committeemen, see the Minutes of the Council of this same date.)

The Treasurer, R. H. Nichols, made his annual report as follows:

REPORT OF THE TREASURER OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY FOR THE YEAR DECEMBER 18, 1922, TO DECEMBER 20, 1923.

CURRENT FUNDS ACCOUNT

Receipts

Balance on hand, Dec. 18, 1922		$1087.76
Dues for Active Membership—		
1921— 4 members	$ 12.00	
1922— 9 members	27.00	
1923—114 members	342.00	
1924— 9 members	27.10	
	408.10	408.10
Dues for Sustaining Membership—		
1922—1 member	10.00	
1923—3 members	30.00	
	40.00	40.00
Royalties on sales of *Papers*, G. P. Putnam's Sons		26.68
Overpaid for dues		6.00
Paid for one volume of *Papers*, Texas University Library		3.00
Total of Receipts		$1571.54

Disbursements

Printing	39.70
Postage	12.07
Stenographer's services	23.42
Stamp pad	.75
Conference on Historical Studies	1.00
Refunded, for dues overpaid	6.00
Total of Disbursements	82.94
Cash in National Bank of Auburn, Dec. 20, 1923, per bank statement	1488.60
	$1571.54

ENDOWMENT FUND ACCOUNT

Total of Fund, Dec. 19, 1922.....	682.26
Interest, Auburn Savings Bank, Dec. 20, 1923, as per bank book.....	27.54
	$709.80

Respectfully submitted,
ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS,
Treasurer.

The Auditing Committee appointed by the President, consisting of Messrs. Hood and Lyttle, reported that they examined the accounts of the Treasurer and found them correct.

The Society adopted the report of the Treasurer as submitted by him and audited by the Committee, and ordered it to be published in its proceedings.

The Editorial Committee reported through the Secretary, calling attention to the publication in December of 1923 of the seventh volume in the Second Series of *Papers*, and the distribution of copies of this book to all members entitled to receive them.

Owing to the absence of the chairmen, no reports were received from the other standing committees of the Society.

A vote of thanks was made to Union Theological Seminary for its kindness in placing its Directors' Room at the disposal of the Society for its annual meetings, and to the Faculty Club of Columbia University for the privilege of taking luncheon in its rooms.

The thanks of the Society were voted to the Secretary for his work in editing the last volume of its *Papers*.

At 4:30 the Society resumed its literary session. The first paper of the afternoon was prepared by Ernest Cushing Richardson, of Princeton University, Princeton, N. J., and in his absence was read by W. N. Schwarze, the subject

being *Church Historical Research and Library Co-operation.* The paper was discussed by Messrs. Nichols and Stout.

The final paper of the session was that by the Rev. Basil Kusiw, of Bloomfield Theological Seminary, Bloomfield, N. J., and was read, at his request, by Prof. Henry J. Weber, the subject being *Protestantism in the Ukraine.* It was discussed by Messrs. Hood, Kieffer, Loetscher, and the author.

At 5:50 the Society adjourned.

Attest: FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER,
Secretary.

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE COUNCIL, DECEMBER 30, 1923

IN accordance with a previous call by the President of the Society, the Council met in Room 211, Union Theological Seminary, New York City, on Monday, December 30, 1923, at 2.30 P.M., President James Coffin Stout in the chair.

Besides the presiding officer, there were present Messrs. Schwarze, Emerton, Weber, Faulkner, Johnson, and Loetscher.

Drs. Good and Washburn were at their request excused for absence.

The Minutes of the last meeting of the Council, the annual meeting of December 26, 1922, were read and approved as read.

The Council accepted with regret the resignations of the following members: Curtis M. Geer, S. Ilmonen, Howard Mowll, Harry Thomas Stock, Curtis H. Walker.

Action with respect to the request of Prof. LaPiana was deferred pending Prof. Emerton's consultation with him.

The following members were suspended from the roll of the Society for non-payment of dues for three years: P. G. Mode, E. F. George, Karl Kretzmann, Clarence Mackinnon.

The following three libraries were elected as Library Members: Auburn Theological Seminary Library, Auburn, N. Y., the Slocum Library, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio, and the University of Texas Library, Austin, Texas.

The following persons were nominated and elected as members:

Rev. Elmer E. S. Johnson, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Church History at Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn.

Professor John Immanuel Knudson, Franklin College, Franklin, Ind.

Dr. J. A. Morehead, National Lutheran Council, 437 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Rev. Basil Kusiw, Instructor in the Ukrainian Language and Literature, Bloomfield Theological Seminary, Bloomfield, N. J.

Rev. Arthur B. Rhinow, M.A., Pastor of the Ridgewood Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Rev. Henry G. Budd, D.D., President of the Wesley Collegiate Institute, Dover, Del.

Rev. H. E. Stocker, Ph.D., Pastor of the First Moravian Church, New York City.

Rev. Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough, Ph.D., Instructor in History, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Rev. Wolcott Cutler, New York City.

On motion the action of the Council in extending the privileges of membership to Mr. S. M. Tenney, of Rusk, Texas, in response to a circular letter addressed to the members of the Council by the Secretary, was confirmed.

The Council, acting as a nominating committee, voted to recommend the following members to serve as officers and members of the standing committees for the year 1924:

President, Henry Jacob Weber;
Vice-President, Shirley Jackson Case;
Secretary, Frederick William Loetscher;
Treasurer, Robert Hastings Nichols.

Former Presidents as Members of Council:

John Alfred Faulkner, Edward Payson Johnson, David Schley Schaff, Henry Bradford Washburn, George Edwin

Horr, Robert Hastings Nichols, Ephraim Emerton, William Nathaniel Schwarze, James Coffin Stout.

Elected Members of Council:

William Walker Rockwell, Otto Hermann Pannkoke, James Isaac Good.

Editorial Committee: J. C. Stout, Chairman; R. H. Nichols, W. N. Schwarze, and the Secretary.

Membership Committee: W. W. Rockwell, Chairman; the President, the Secretary, and the Treasurer.

Committee on Endowment: O. H. Pannkoke, Chairman; J. I. Good, W. W. Rockwell, and H. B. Washburn.

Committee on Conference with the American-Scandinavian Foundation: W. W. Rockwell, Chairman; H. G. Leach, J. G. Hammarsköld, O. M. Norlie.

Committee on Arrangements: W. W. Rockwell.

The Rev. J. H. Horstmann, of St. Louis, presented through the Secretary the following:

Tentative resolution proposing meetings of the American Society of Church History to be held elsewhere than in New York City.

Whereas, Many members of the American Society of Church History in the Middle West are prevented from attending the meetings of the Society because these are always held in New York City, and

Whereas, Most of these members could take a more active interest in the Society and its work, if it were possible for them to attend its meetings at least occasionally, and

Whereas, There are in the States of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Kentucky, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska, and Colorado, and in adjacent States and in Canada more than fifty Protestant theological seminaries (see *Year Book of the Churches*, 1923), not a few of them of national reputation and influence, and all of them representing a great and important

constituency with a historical background of unusual variety, interest, and value, and

Whereas, More than fifty, or over forty per cent, of the present members of the Society reside within easy reach of either Chicago or St. Louis; therefore

Be it resolved: That the American Society of Church History authorize those of its members who find it more convenient to reach one or the other of these cities, and who desire to do so, to arrange, with the approval of the officers, for an annual meeting at one or the other of these cities, in rotation, at such a time as may be found convenient. The officers of the Society are hereby requested to carry out the purpose of this resolution.

After some discussion of this resolution, it was on motion referred to a special committee, consisting of the President, the Treasurer, and the Secretary, for consideration and report at the next meeting of the Council.

The time having come for the adjourned meeting of the Society, the Council adjourned to meet at the call of the President.

At 5:45 P.M., the Council re-convened at the call of the President.

The request of Dr. Rockwell to have preprints made of his forthcoming article on *The Aims and Needs of the American Society of Church History in the Light of European Experience*, was referred to the Editorial Committee with power.

The request of J. Franklin Jameson, of the Department of Historical Research, Carnegie Institution of Washington, for copies of the publications of the Society for the University of Tokio, which suffered great losses by reason of the recent earthquake and fire, was granted, and the Secretary was instructed to secure for this purpose as nearly complete a set of our publications as possible.

The request of Franz Boaz that the Society send complimentary copies of Volume VII of its *Papers* (in addition to those already sent of preceding volumes) to the Staatsbiblio-

thek, of Berlin, and to the Library of Göttingen University, Göttingen, Germany, was granted; but it was decided not to send copies of this or earlier volumes to the University of Münster, as requested in the same letter.

On motion, the Council adjourned.

Attest: FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER,
Secretary.

EIGHTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE SOCIETY, DECEMBER 29th, 1924

THE American Society of Church History held its eighteenth annual meeting in the Directors' Room of Union Theological Seminary, Broadway at 120th Street, New York City, on Monday, December 29th, 1924.

MORNING SESSION

The meeting was called to order at 10:20 by President Henry J. Weber, and prayer was offered by Dr. P. J. Healy.

The following members were found present: Messrs. H. J. Weber, W. W. Rockwell, F. W. Loetscher, R. H. Nichols, C. E. Corwin, W. J. Hinke, G. W. Richards, P. Smith, J. A. Faulkner, E. R. Goodenough, E. S. Worcester, G. E. Horr, J. L. Neve, W. N. Schwarze, P. J. Healy, H. E. Stocker, G. U. Wenner; also the following guests of the Society, some of whom were subsequently elected as members: O. L. Cole, H. Eells, W. N. R. Dailey, G. Yoshida, H. Dressel, F. Bouvier, J. Denham, T. P. Peardon, T. Ariga, T. Uwoki.

President Henry J. Weber, of Bloomfield Theological Seminary, Bloomfield, N. J., began the literary session with the reading of the Presidential Address, entitled *The Formal Dialectical Rationalism of Calvin*. The paper was discussed by Messrs. Loetscher, Faulkner, Rockwell, Healy, Neve, and the author.

The second paper was by George W. Richards, of the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the United States, Lancaster, Pa., on the subject *Dr. James I. Good as a*

Church Historian. It was discussed by Messrs. Hinke, Richards, Faulkner, and Neve.

L. Franklin Gruber, of the Lutheran Church of the Reformation, St. Paul, a prospective member of the Society, was the author of the next paper, which was read in his absence by Dr. W. W. Rockwell. It was entitled *The Achtliederbuch of 1524: A Quadricentennial Study.* It was discussed by Messrs. Rockwell, Wenner, and Schwarze.

The Treasurer, Dr. Nichols, having made request that a committee of auditors be appointed to audit his accounts, the chair appointed Messrs. Faulkner and Schwarze to perform this duty. They reported at a later session of the Society.

At 1:15 P. M. the Society adjourned to take luncheon, according to a previous arrangement, at the Faculty Club of Columbia University, at 400 117th Street; New York City.

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Society re-convened at 3:15. In addition to the members recorded as present at the morning session, the following members attended: G. L. Kieffer and A. Steimle.

By common consent the remaining papers were read and discussed before the business of the annual meeting was transacted.

Edward S. Worcester, of the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in America at New Brunswick, N. J., read the first paper of the afternoon on the subject: *An Unworked Vein in Historical Theology.* Remarks were made by Dr. Schwarze.

The final paper of the session was by Erwin R. Goodenough, of Yale University, New Haven, Conn., on the subject *The Pseudo-Justinian Oratio ad Graecos.* It was discussed by Dr. Faulkner.

At this point the business meeting of the Society was called to order by President Weber

The Minutes of the last annual meeting, that of December 30th, 1923, were read and approved as read.

The Secretary reported to the Society the actions of the Council since the last annual meeting of the Society, and on motion these were approved by the Society.

The annual report of the Treasurer, Dr. R. H. Nichols, was read, and the Committee of Auditors, Messrs. Faulkner and Schwarze, having reported that they examined the accounts of the Treasurer and found them correct, the report was ordered published with the approval of the Society. The report is as follows:—

Report of the Treasurer for the Year December 20, 1923, to December 19, 1924.

CURRENT FUNDS ACCOUNT

Receipts

Balance on hand, Dec. 20, 1923		$1488.60
Dues for Active Membership:		
1921— 2 members	$ 6.00	
1922— 6 members	18.00	
1923— 26 members	78.00	
1924—121 members	363.00	
1925— 9 members	27.00	
1926— 1 member	3.00	
	495.00	495.00
Dues for Sustaining Membership:		
1924—4 members	40.00	40.00
Overpaid for dues		3.00
Sales of *Papers*		6.00
Replacement of check returned		3.00
For collection of checks		.25
		$2035.85

Disbursements

Printing	$ 23.20
Postage	41.00
Stenographers' services	8.84
Telegram	1.11
Refund for dues overpaid	6.00
Paid to bank on account of check returned	3.00
Conference of Historical Societies	1.00
Publication of Volume 7 of *Papers*	1288.00
Carriage and wrapping on Volume 7	14.79
(Note: This bill was $29.19, from which Messrs. G. P. Putnam's Sons deducted the amount of royalties due on volumes of *Papers*, $14.40, leaving the net amount $14.79)	
Total of disbursements	$1386.94
Cash in National Bank, Auburn, N. Y., per statement	648.91
	$2035.85

ENDOWMENT FUND ACCOUNT

Total of Fund, Dec. 20, 1923	$ 709.80
Interest, Auburn Savings Bank	28.64
Half Life Membership	50.00
Cash in Auburn Savings Bank, Dec. 19, 1924	$ 788.44

Respectfully submitted,
ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS,
Treasurer.

Accounts examined and found correct as per above statement.
Attest: JOHN A. FAULKNER,
WILLIAM N. SCHWARZE,
Committee of Auditors.

The Secretary reported in behalf of the Editorial Committee that it was hoped to publish another volume of *Papers* during the next fiscal year.

The Secretary reported that he attended to the correspondence of his office and sent complimentary copies of the Papers of the Society as directed at the last meeting of the Society.

The thanks of the Society were on motion tendered to the Union Theological Seminary for its kindness in permitting the Society as usual to meet in the Directors Room of the Seminary.

The recommendations of the Council for officers and members of standing committees for the ensuing year were on motion adopted, and the President declared the several nominees duly elected. (For the list of officers and committees see the Minutes of the Council of this same date).

A vote of thanks was given to the Secretary for his fidelity in attending to the duties of his office.

On motion the Society adjourned to meet at the appointed time next December.

Attest: FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER,
Secretary.

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE COUNCIL, DECEMBER 29, 1924

IN accordance with a previous call by the President of the Society, the Council met in Room 211, Union Theological Seminary, New York City, on Monday, December 29, 1924, at 2:30 P.M., President Henry J. Weber in the chair.

Besides the President there were present Messrs. Schwarze, Faulkner, Horr, Nichols, Loetscher, and Rockwell.

The resignations of the following six members were accepted with regret: R. W. Sockman, J. H. Logan, T. J. Shahan, D. Gustafson, T. A. Tidball, and G. LaPiana.

The names of O. E. Brown and K. DeMura were ordered stricken from the roll in accordance with the constitutional requirement in regard to members who fail to pay dues for three years in succession.

The following persons and libraries were duly elected into the membership of the Society:

The Library of the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Seminary Hill, Texas.
Prof. T. P. Oakley, Ph.D., 915 South Jefferson St., Mexico, Mo.
Prof. Louise Ropes Loomis, Wells College, Aurora, N. Y.
Prof. T. P. Peardon, Barnard College, New York.
Frederick L. Weis, Saylesville, R. I.
Rev. Hastings Eells, Ph.D., Paoli, Pa.
L. Franklin Gruber, D.D. LL.D., The Lutheran Church of the Reformation, St. Paul, Minn.
Mr. Corliss F. Randolph, President of the Seventh Day Baptist Historical Society, Newark, N. J.

Rev. George Wales King, D.D., 1716 Waverly Place, St. Louis, Mo.
Rev. E. C. Vanderlan, D.D., Kinderhook, N. Y.
Rev. Henry H. Meyer, 150 Fifth Ave., New York.
Rev. Edwin Fairley, 299 Madison Ave., New York.
James F. Willard, Ph.D., University of Colorado, Boulder, Col.

Prof. Stoddard Lane, Ph.D., Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn.
Prof. W. D. Schemerhorn, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.
Rev. Charles E. Byrer, Bexley Hall, Kenyon College, Gambier, O.
Prof. Paul H. Roth, Northwestern Lutheran Theological Seminary, Minneapolis, Minn.
Prof. Frank G. Beardsley, Fountain Park Congregational Church, St. Louis, Mo.
Rev. W. E. Garrison, Ph. D., Disciples Divinity House, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Rev. William L. Burdick, D.D., Corresponding Secretary of the Seventh Day Baptist Missionary Society, Ashaway, R. I.
Rodney L. McQuary, College of the Bible, Lexington, Ky.

The Special Committee consisting of the President, Secretary and Treasurer, which was appointed at the last meeting of the Council to report on the proposal of the Rev. J. H. Horstmann concerning additional literary meetings of the Society in cities other than New York, reported through Dr. Nichols, recommending the adoption of the following resolution, which was discussed and unanimously adopted:—

Resolved, That Mr. Horstmann, Dr. S. J. Case, Dr. Rockwell and the Secretary, with the first as chairman, be a committee authorized to arrange, if the way be clear, for a

literary meeting of the Society in Chicago or St. Louis before December 1, 1925, and to prepare the program for this meeting.

The Council voted to recommend that the following persons serve in the offices and on the committees of the Society for the ensuing year, viz.:

President, Shirley Jackson Case;

Vice-President, William Walker Rockwell;

Secretary, Frederick William Loetscher;

Treasurer, Robert Hastings Nichols.

Former Presidents as Members of Council:

David Schley Schaff, Henry Bradford Washburn, George Edwin Horr, Robert Hastings Nichols, Ephraim Emerton, William Nathaniel Schwarze, James Coffin Stout, Henry Jacob Weber, John Alfred Faulkner.

Elected Members of Council

Otto Hermann Pannkoke, George Warren Richards, and Edward Strong Worcester.

Editorial Committee: H. J. Weber, Chairman; W. N. Schwarze, R. H. Nichols, and F. W. Loetscher.

Membership Committee: W. W. Rockwell, Chairman; the President, the Secretary, and the Treasurer.

Committee on Endowment: O. H. Pannkoke, Chairman; W. W. Rockwell, H. B. Washburn, and F. W. Loetscher.

Committee on Local Arrangements: W. W. Rockwell, Chairman.

The Committee on Conference with the American-Scandinavian Foundation was, at its own request, discharged with the thanks of the Society.

The Council approved of the policy proposed by one of its members that the dues of $100 for a life membership may be paid in two successive years, fifty dollars each year.

The Editorial Committee was authorized to publish another volume of *Papers* during the next fiscal year and was given power to determine the relative order of the articles to be included in the book.

On motion it was voted that the request of Mr. Waldo S. Leland, of the Carnegie Institute of Washington, D. C., for information in regard to the Society be granted, and that Dr. Rockwell in consultation with the Secretary and the Treasurer be requested to furnish the information desired.

It was on motion resolved that the Secretary request Messrs. G. P. Putnam's Sons to send five copies of Volume 7 of our *Papers* to Dr. Rockwell for free distribution at his discretion in the interests of the Society.

At 3:20 P.M., the Council adjourned, subject to the call of the President, in order that its members could attend the meeting of the Society.

Attest: FREDERICK WILLIAM LOETSCHER,
Secretary.

SPECIAL LITERARY MEETING OF THE SOCIETY AT CHICAGO, JUNE, 1925

A LITERARY meeting of the American Society of Church History, authorized under a resolution of the Council, and arranged by a committee consisting of Rev. J. H. Horstmann, Chairman, President S. J. Case, Secretary F. W. Loetscher, and W. W. Rockwell, was held in the Haskell Oriental Museum of the University of Chicago, on Friday and Saturday, June 19th and 20th, 1925.

FIRST SESSION, FRIDAY AFTERNOON, JUNE 19, 1925

President Case called the meeting to order on Friday afternoon, June 19th, at 2:07 o'clock, and gave an address of welcome. He appointed W. W. Rockwell acting secretary.

The following members of the Society were present: President Case, Messrs. Leon Arpee, S. G. Ayers, C. T. Baillie, W. E. Garrison, E. F. George, J. H. Horstmann, A. W. Nagler, P. V. Norwood, W. W. Rockwell, and M. Spinka. The guests included: C. J. Attig, A. A. Bedikian, J. F. Carlyon, P. N. Crusius, E. Lauer, E. Joranson, O. A. Marti, H. R. Niebuhr, E. W. Parsons, C. E. Schneider, S. B. Sperry, R. T. Stamm, Joseph Tellie, J. W. Thompson, H. W. Walker, J. W. Weddell, and R. H. White: total, twenty-eight.

The first paper was read by Prof. Percy V. Norwood of the Western Theological Seminary, Chicago, on *Anglo-Lutheran Relations*. This was discussed by the acting secretary.

Prof. James Westfall Thompson, of the University of Chicago, read the second paper, entitled *Some Social and Economic Factors in the History of the Church in the Fourth Century*. It was discussed by J. H. Horstmann and by J. W. Weddell.

The third paper, *An Examination of the State of Slavic Studies in Church History*, was read by Prof. Matthew Spinka of the Central Theological Seminary, Dayton, O. It was discussed by the acting secretary and by S. G. Ayers.

The fourth paper, on *Nicholas Cusa*, was presented by its author, Prof. Paul N. Crusius, of Elmhurst College, Elmhurst, Ill., and the fifth, dealing with *Los Pastores: A New Mexico Mystery Play*, was presented by Prof. W. E. Garrison of the Disciples Divinity House at the University of Chicago.

The members and friends of the Society were guests of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago at a dinner at the Quadrangle Club at 6:30 on June 19th. President Case was in the chair, and called on Prof. Gerald Birney Smith to extend the welcome of the University to the Society.

SECOND SESSION, FRIDAY EVENING, JUNE 19th

The discussion of future plans for the Society was led by Rev. J. H. Horstmann, who stated that church history in this country should be Americanized, and that the mid-western section of our Society should give especial attention to the biographies of church leaders in the Mississippi Valley, where there are approximately sixty theological seminaries supported by about twenty denominations. He suggested that the Society should publish, instead of its biennial volumes of *Papers*, a quarterly journal, and should undertake an active campaign to increase membership. He also suggested a number of topics needing investigation.

The discussion then became general. The acting secretary called attention to the requirement of the Membership Corporation Law of the State of New York, in which the Society is incorporated, to the effect that the annual meeting for business must be held in New York on a specified date, which is the last Monday of December. He advised the election of a sufficient number of members of the Middle

West as members of the Council to make possible the requisite quorum of five to transact business, so that the Council could meet in the Middle West as well as in New York.

It was voted that the present Committee of Arrangements plan for another meeting, to be held at the invitation of Eden Theological Seminary, St. Louis, in that city, probably during the Easter recess, 1926.

It was voted to appoint a committee to collect information on work already done in the field of American Church History by denominational and other historical societies, by libraries, etc.; and to present a program concerning what remains to be done.

It was voted that the present Committee of Arrangements should receive nominations for membership in the Society, and present them to the Council at the next annual meeting.

A lively discussion ensued concerning the importance of work in the field of American Church History and concerning the necessity of securing an adequate endowment for the Society. Dr. Horstmann advocated the raising of the annual dues from $3.00 to $5.00 and the publishing of a periodical semiannually. The session closed at 10:35 P.M.

THE THIRD SESSION, SATURDAY MORNING, JUNE 20

The third session of the Society was held in Room 17 of Haskell Oriental Museum on Saturday morning, June 20th. President Case called the meeting to order at 9 o'clock. The following paper was read: *Wyclif's Theory of the Disendowment of the Church*, by Prof. Oscar A. Marti of the State Teachers College, Kirksville, Mo. It was discussed by Messrs. Horstmann, Norwood, and the acting secretary.

The second paper was on *Hildebrand: Builder of the Papacy*, by Prof. A. W. Nagler of the Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.

The third paper was on the subject *Religious Life in the Old North West, 1787–1803*, and was presented by Prof. C. J. Attig of North-Western College, Naperville, Ill.

The final paper was on *Practical Projects in the Field of Church History*, and was read by Prof. W. W. Rockwell of the Union Theological Seminary, New York, and was discussed by J. H. Horstmann.

This third session was attended by eighteen members and guests. After approving the minutes of the three sessions, the Society adjourned at 12:18 P.M.

Attest: WILLIAM W. ROCKWELL,
Acting Secretary.

NINETEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE SOCIETY, DECEMBER 28, 1925

THE American Society of Church History convened for its nineteenth annual meeting in the Directors' Room of Union Theological Seminary, Broadway at 120th Street, New York City, on Monday, December 28, 1925.

MORNING SESSION

The meeting was called to order at 10:10 by President Shirley J. Case, and prayer was offered by Dr. George W. Richards.

The following members were present at this session: J. C. Ayer, S. J. Case, W. H. T. Dau, H. Eells, E. Emerton, J. A. Faulkner, E. R. Goodenough, P. T. Healy, R. W. Heintze, W. J. Hinke, F. J. F. Jackson, G. L. Kieffer, F. W. Loetscher, R. H. Nichols, S. Rees, A. B. Rhinow, G. W. Richards, W. W. Rockwell, W. N. Schwarze, H. E. Stocker, J. C. Stout, H. H. Tryon, H. J. Weber, A. R. Wentz, E. S. Worcester; also the following guests, some of whom were later elected as members of the Society: D. B. Ambrosio, W. F. Badé, W. E. Bauer, D. M. Beck, E. R. Davol, O. H. Dietrich, M. J. Hoffman, H. C. Offerman, J. B. O'Leilly, F. Saez, W. L. Sanders, E. T. Sechler, W. R. Siegart, S. D. Wakefield: a total of thirty-nine.

The literary meeting began with the presentation of the Presidential Address by Shirley Jackson Case, of the University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., the subject being *The*

Acceptance of Christianity by the Roman Emperors. The paper was discussed by Dr. Nichols and the author.

The second paper was by Patrick Joseph Healy, of the Catholic University, Washington, D. C., on the subject *Mysticism of the School of St. Victor.* It was discussed by Dr. Emerton.

William Herman Theodore Dau, of the Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo., read the third paper of the morning, the subject being *The Delay of Luther's Departure from Worms after his Hearing before the Diet.* It was discussed by Dr. Faulkner.

On motion the paper by Erwin R. Goodenough, of Yale University, New Haven, Conn., appointed for the afternoon session, was made the fourth and last paper of the morning session. It was on the subject *Philo and Public Life.*

The Treasurer, Dr. Nichols, requested that a committee of auditors be appointed to audit his accounts for the last year, and the President appointed Drs. Emerton and Stout. Their report was presented later in the day.

At 1 P.M. the Society adjourned to take luncheon, according to arrangements previously made by W. W. Rockwell, the committee on local arrangements, at the Faculty Club of Columbia University, at 400 117th St., New York.

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Society re-convened for the afternoon at 3:30, and transacted the following business.

The Minutes of the last annual meeting of the Society, December 29, 1924, and those of the Special Literary Meeting held in Chicago, June 19 and 20, 1925, were read and approved.

Dr. Rockwell informed the Society that one of our members, Prof. Hastings Eells, had prepared for publication "Some Unpublished Letters of Bucer, the Reformer of

Strassburg," and moved that they be read by title, and that the publication of them by the Society be referred to the Editorial Committee. The motion was carried.

The Secretary read the actions of the Council taken since the last meeting of the Society, and on motion these were approved.

Messrs. Emerton and Stout, the committee appointed to audit the Treasurer's accounts, reported that they performed this duty and that they found the accounts correct.

The Treasurer, R. H. Nichols, then made his report for the current fiscal year. It was approved and ordered published in our proceedings. It is as follows:

REPORT OF THE TREASURER OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY FOR THE YEAR, DECEMBER 20, 1924, TO DECEMBER 18, 1925.

CURRENT FUNDS ACCOUNT

Receipts

Balance on hand, Dec. 20, 1924		$ 648.91
Dues for Active Membership:		
1922— 1 member	$ 3.00	
1923— 8 members	24.00	
1924— 11 members	33.00	
1925—129 members	387.65	
1926— 11 members	33.00	
	480.65	480.65
Dues for Sustaining Members:		
1925—3 members	$ 30.00	30.00
Sales of *Papers*	43.37	43.37
Contribution by Dr. H. J. Weber for Vol. VIII of our *Papers*	50.00	50.00
		$1252.93

Disbursements

Printing	$ 38.70
Postage	20.91
Stenography	4.05
Conference of Historical Societies	1.00
Total	64.66
Cash in National Bank of Auburn per bank statement, Dec. 18, 1925	1188.27
	$1252.93

ENDOWMENT FUND ACCOUNT TO DEC. 22, 1925

Total of Fund, Dec. 20, 1924	$ 788.44
Interest, Auburn Savings Bank	31.48
Half Life Membership	50.00
Bequest from Dr. J. I. Good	102.26
Cash in Auburn Savings Bank, Dec. 22, 1925, per bank book	$ 972.18

Respectfully submitted,
ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS,
Treasurer.

Examined and found correct.
Attest: E. EMERTON, J. C. STOUT } *Committee of auditors.*

On the recommendation of the Treasurer it was voted that a committee of two be appointed to co-operate with him in the investment of the Endowment Funds of the Society. The President appointed Pres. Kerr D. Macmillan, of Aurora, and Pres. G. W. Richards, of Lancaster, to serve on this committee.

It was moved, seconded and carried that the Committee on Endowment be authorized at its discretion to participate in joint campaigns of learned societies for endowment funds.

The recommendations of the Council for election of officers and committees for the following year were read by the Secretary, and on motion the Society instructed him to cast a ballot for these nominees, whereupon they were declared elected. (For the list of officers and committees, see the Minutes of the Council of this date.)

W. W. Rockwell submitted in writing an amendment to Article Six, Section 1, of the Constitution of the Society, to the effect that the annual dues for active members shall be five dollars, instead of three dollars.

R. H. Nichols submitted in writing an amendment to the same section, proposing that the annual dues be four instead of three dollars.

In accordance with the provisions of the Constitution for amendments, these proposals were received for record and for action at a subsequent annual meeting.

The following resolution was on motion adopted: Resolved, That the Society learns with satisfaction that the Literary Meeting, held at Chicago, June, 1925, appointed a committee to collect information on work already done in the field of American Church History by denominational and other societies, libraries, etc., and to present a program concerning what remains to be done.

Votes of thanks were passed as follows: to Union Theological Seminary for its kind hospitality to the Society; to Dr. Henry J. Weber, for his contribution of $50 for the publication of the next volume of *Papers;* and to the Secretary for his fidelity in discharging the duties of his office.

The Society thereupon resumed its literary session. A letter was read from Theodore C. Decker, of Philadelphia, who was to have read a paper on "Luther's Theory of the Proper Relation of Church and State," in which he expressed his regret at not being able to attend the meeting and his hope that he may present the paper at another meeting.

The Society then listened to the two remaining papers of

the day: the one by John Mason Kelso, of the Wesley Collegiate Institute, Dover, Del., on the theme *De Macario Magno*, which was read, in the absence of the author, by J. A. Faulkner; and the other by Hastings Eells, of the Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, O., on the theme *The Genesis of Martin Bucer's Supper Doctrine.*

On motion the Society adjourned.

Attest: FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER,
Secretary.

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE COUNCIL, DECEMBER 28, 1925

IN accordance with a previous announcement by the President of the Society, the Council met in Room 202, Union Theological Seminary, New York City, on Monday, December 28, 1925, at 1 P.M., President Shirley J. Case in the chair.

The following members of the Council were present: Messrs. Case, Emerton, Faulkner, Loetscher, Nichols, Richards, Rockwell, Schwarze, Stout, Worcester.

The Minutes of the last meeting of the Council, December 29, 1924, were read and approved.

The resignations of Paul E. Whitmer and Hugo M. Wendel as members of the Society were accepted with regret.

E. F. Albertsworth, being in arrears for dues for three years, was dropped from the roll. The case of T. T. Lew, likewise in arrears, was postponed for consideration at a later meeting.

At 1:15 the Council adjourned to go with the members of the Society and its guests to luncheon at the Faculty Club of Columbia University.

The Council met again at 2:40, the same officers and members being present.

The Council voted to recommend the following persons to be elected by the Society as officers and members of committees:

President, William Walker Rockwell.
Vice-President, George Warren Richards;
Secretary, Frederick William Loetscher;
Treasurer, Robert Hastings Nichols.

Former Presidents as Members of Council: Henry Bradford Washburn, George Edwin Horr, Robert Hastings Nichols, Ephraim Emerton, William Nathaniel Schwarze, James Coffin Stout, Henry Jacob Weber, John Alfred Faulkner, Shirley Jackson Case.

Elected Members of Council:

Otto Hermann Pannkoke, Edward Strong Worcester, Julius Herman Horstmann.

Editorial Committee: S. J. Case, Chairman; H. J. Weber, the Secretary, the Treasurer.

Membership Committee: W. W. Rockwell, Chairman; S. J. Case, J. H. Horstmann, the Secretary, and the Treasurer.

Committee on Endowment: O. H. Pannkoke, Chairman; W. W. Rockwell, H. B. Washburn, F. W. Loetscher.

Committee on Local Arrangements: W. W. Rockwell.

Committee on Financing Publications: E. S. Worcester, Chairman; H. J. Weber, J. H. Horstmann, A. Griscom.

On motion the last named committee was given power to add to its number.

The following persons were on motion elected into the membership of the Society:

Rev. T. Tetsutaro, Kyoto, Japan.
Rev. A. A. Bedikian, 152 E. 34th St., New York City.
Rev. Harold S. Bender, Goshen College, Goshen, Ind.
Rev. F. Z. Browne, Main and Fifth St., Texarkana, Texas.
Rev. John Stanley Cornett, Ph.D.
Prof. Ernst Cornell, Ph.D., Goshen College, Goshen, Ind.
Prof. Paul M. Crusius, Elmhurst College, Elmhurst, Ill.
Rev. Otto H. Dietrich, 98 William St., Orange, N. J.
Prof. Frank Eakin, Ph.D., Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Prof. E. F. George, Evangelical Theological Seminary, Naperville, Ill.

Prof. Everett Stetson Hammond, Ph.D., Kimball School of Theology, Salem, Oregon.
Prof. Milton J. Hoffman, New Brunswick, N. J.
Prof. Charles Michael Jacobs, D.D., Lutheran Theological Seminary, Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.
Prof. George LaPiana, Harvard Divinity School, Cambridge, Mass.
Rev. Frederic Nye Lindsay, Ph.D., 295 Washington Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Prof. Elmer Truesdale Merrill, Box 44, La Puerta del Sol Road, Santa Barbara, Calif.
Prof. Arthur H. Otis, University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz.
President George A. Romoser, Concordia Institute, Bronxville, N. Y.
Prof. C. E. Schneider, Eden Theological Seminary, Webster Groves, Mo.
Florencio Saez, Union Theological Seminary, Broadway at 120th St., New York.
Rev. Paul W. Spaude, Lake Benton, Minn.
Joseph Tetlie.
Henry Hammersly Walker, 5800 Blackstone Ave., Chicago, Ill.
Prof. J. E. Wishart, San Francisco Theological Seminary, San Anselmo, Calif.

The Council approved the recommendation of the Chicago meeting that the same committee that arranged for the Chicago meeting of the Society last June be appointed to arrange for the forthcoming spring meeting of the Society in St. Louis; namely, J. H. Horstmann, Chairman, and Messrs. Case, Rockwell and Loetscher.

The Council approved, and instructed the Treasurer to pay, the bill of the Eden Publishing House for printing contracted for in connection with the June meeting of the Society in Chicago.

On motion it was voted that the Society authorize the payment by the Treasurer of expenses for printing and postage in connection with any future meetings of the Society.

The Secretary was authorized to prepare and have printed a circular descriptive of the forthcoming volume of our *Papers*.

The Secretary was authorized to have 300 offprints made of the Constitution, By-Laws, and List of Members of the Society, after the next volume has been prepared.

The Council adjourned at 3:30.

Attest: FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER,
Secretary.

SPECIAL LITERARY MEETING OF THE SOCIETY, ST. LOUIS, APRIL, 1926

THE second Midwest Literary Meeting of the American Society of Church History convened at room 102, Eden Theological Seminary, Webster Groves, Mo., at 2:15 P.M., on Friday, April 2, 1926. Those present were: Andrew Baird, Manitoba College, Winnipeg; W. Baur, Eden Theological Seminary, Webster Groves, Mo.; S. J. Case, University of Chicago, Chicago; John S. Cornett, College of Emporia, Emporia, Kansas; W. E. Garrison, University of Chicago, Chicago; E. F. George, Evangelical Theological Seminary, Naperville, Ill.; A. A. Hays, McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.; Jesse Johnson, Xenia Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.; Donald McFayden, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.; Oscar A. Marti, State Teachers College, Kirksville, Mo.; F. Mayer, Eden Theological Seminary, Webster Groves, Mo.; W. W. Rockwell, Union Theological Seminary, New York City; W. D. Schermerhorn, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill., C. E. Schneider, Eden Theological Seminary, Webster Groves, Mo.; (Miss) Lucy Simmons, State Teachers College, Kirksville, Mo.; Matthew Spinka, Central Theological Seminary, Dayton, O.; and Rev. J. H. Horstmann, St. Louis, Mo.

W. W. Rockwell called the meeting to order and Andrew Baird offered prayer. On motion duly seconded, C. E. Schneider was elected Secretary *pro tem.* After a word of greeting from the chairman, the meeting proceeded immediately with the hearing and discussion of the papers.

In the absence of Prof. G. P. Mode, of the University of Chicago, who was to have read a paper on *The Religious*

Significance of Colonialism, Prof. J. S. Cornett, of the College of Emporia, Emporia, Kan., presented his paper on the subject, *The Attitude of Early Christianity Toward Paganism.* It was discussed by Messrs. Case, Baird, and Schemerhorn.

This was followed by a paper by Prof. E. F. George, of the Evangelical Theological Seminary of Naperville, Naperville, Ill., on *The Log College of the Neshaminy*, which was discussed by Messrs. Hays, Garrison, Rockwell, and McFayden.

Prof. William Baur, of Eden Theological Seminary, Webster Groves, Mo., then presented *The Life of Joseph Rieger.* The paper was discussed by Messrs. Rockwell and Horstmann. At the conclusion of this paper a recess of ten minutes was taken.

The last paper of the afternoon was read by S. J. Case, of the University of Chicago, on *The Acceptance of Christianity by the Roman Emperors.* It was discussed by Messrs. McFayden, Marti, Baur, Cornett, Schermerhorn, Spinka, and Baird.

The afternoon meeting adjourned at 5:50.

After the dinner in the refectory, where the visitors were the guests of the Seminary, deliberations were resumed in the reception room. In the absence of Dr. S. D. Press, president of the Seminary, C. E. Schneider spoke a word of greeting, which was responded to by Pres. Rockwell. Special cognizance was taken of the presence of A. Baird, who had travelled from Canada to be present at this meeting, and who favored the Assembly with a report of the recent church union in Canada. A lively discussion ensued.

Pres. Rockwell reported on the annual meeting of the Society held in New York on December 28, 1925. Reference was made to the constitutional provisions of the Society stipulating that the annual business meetings must be held in New York. To effect a closer *rapprochement* with the western contingent of the Society, the plan was evolved so to distribute the membership of the Council that business

may be transacted in the West, if the necessary quorum of five out of the fifteen members can be secured. The establishment of an "American Journal of Church History" was also discussed. Attention was also called to some of the current developments in the field of church history and to some of the pending enterprises.

In the absence of Prof. Mode, Prof. S. J. Case, of Chicago, reported on the progress of the research committee which had been appointed at the Chicago meeting of the Society, the purpose of which was to locate and classify the unknown sources of American Church History. Due to the added importance of older collections and the accretions of new materials in private libraries and collections of denominational historical societies, etc., it was thought that such inquiries would naturally extend beyond the scope of the Allison survey, published in 1910. In pursuance of this plan Prof. Mode, the chairman of the above-mentioned committee, had addressed a questionnaire to numerous libraries. The question was raised as to the adequacy of the questionnaire method to achieve the ends desired. It was finally decided that the project in hand could best be pursued by the division of the field into geographically defined districts, in which territorial committees could be assigned to the more definite tasks of amplifying the Allison findings, enlisting in this work the co-operation of denominational and other local historical agencies.

It was voted that a committee of three be nominated to decide on place, date, and programme of the next Western literary meeting of the Society, and to consider as a prominent part of its duties the evolving and carrying out of plans for the discovery of unpublished and other valuable historical documents—this to be accomplished by territorial committees to be organized by the above-mentioned committee. This committee shall have the privilege of enlarging its membership as occasion may require.

Pursuant to a resolution of the Council, the financial expenditures incident to this work will be borne by the Society. The following were nominated to constitute this committee: Prof. Schermerhorn, as chairman, and Messrs. Schneider and Spinka. Invitations to hold the next literary meeting at Garrett Biblical Institute and the University of Chicago were referred to this committee.

The final session of the Society was called to order by the president on Saturday morning at 9 o'clock.

The first paper of the morning was read by W. E. Garrison, of the Disciples Divinity House of the University of Chicago, the subject being *The Restoration of Papal Sovereignty*. In view of the fact that some of the members desired to leave on early trains, it was decided to postpone the discussion of the papers until the last paper had been presented.

The following papers were read: *Russian Progressive Religious Thought*, by Matthew Spinka, of the Central Theological Seminary, Dayton, Ohio; *Log College Theology*, by A. A. Hays, of McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago; *The Rise and Growth of Religious Bodies in Missouri Territory*, by (Miss) Lucy Simmons, of the State Teachers College, Kirksville, Mo.; *A Recent Statement of Calvinism*, by Jesse Johnson, of Xenia Theological Seminary, St. Louis. Due to the lateness of the hour, it was decided to omit discussions of the papers.

The Minutes of the preceding session of the Society on April 2d were read by the Secretary *pro tempore* and were approved.

Among the items of business transacted at the morning session belongs the report of Dr. Schermerhorn's committee announcing the acceptance of Chicago University as the place for the next literary meeting, which is to be held on March 25th and 26th, 1927, and outlining the tentative programme for said meeting.

On motion of Prof. Baird the meeting expressed its

appreciation of the promptness with which Prof. Schermerhorn reported in behalf of his committee. By unanimous vote the Society expressed its appreciation of the presence of Dr. Rockwell, who as president of the Society had travelled such a long distance to lend the inspiration of his presence toward making the meeting so decidedly successful.

Adjournment followed at 12:10 P. M.

Attest: CARL E. SCHNEIDER,
Secretary pro tem.

TWENTIETH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE SOCIETY, DECEMBER 27, 1926

THE American Society of Church History held its twentieth annual meeting in the Directors' Room of Union Theological Seminary, Broadway at 120th Street, New York City, on Monday December 27, 1926.

MORNING SESSION

The meeting was called to order at 10:25 o'clock by President William Walker Rockwell, and prayer was offered by G. W. Richards.

The following members were present at this session: S. J. Case, Chicago, Ill.; Frank Eakin, Pittsburgh, Pa.; J. A. Faulkner, Madison, N. J.; W. E. Garrison, Chicago, Ill.; W. J. Hinke, Auburn, N. Y.; F. J. Foakes Jackson, New York City; G. L. Kieffer, Rosedale, Long Island, N. Y.; F. W. Lindsay, Brooklyn, N. Y.; F. W. Loetscher, Princeton, N. J.; R. H. Nichols, Auburn, N. Y.; A. B. Rhinow, Ridgewood, New York City; G. W. Richards, Lancaster, Pa.; W. W. Rockwell, New York City; W. N. Schwarze, Bethlehem, Pa.; H. H. Walker, Chicago, Ill.; A. R. Wentz, Gettysburg, Pa.

There were present also the following guests: T. M. Balliet, New York City; R. Cramer, New York City; B. Dallmann, Milwaukee, Wis.; J. W. FitzGerald, Brooklyn, N. Y.; P. N. Garber, Durham, N. C.; C. J. Glaukler, New York City; S. T. McCloy, New York City; J. L. Maddox, Orono, Me.; H. H. Schaff, Ithaca, N. Y.; P. E. Shaw, Hartford, Conn.; Miss Alma R. Van Hoevenberg, Kingston, N. Y.

President William Walker Rockwell, Librarian of Union Theological Seminary, New York, began the literary session with the reading of his Presidential Address on the subject *Bias in the Writing of Church History.*

The second paper was by David Schley Schaff, of the Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pa., on the subject *The Bellarmine-Jefferson Legend and the Declaration of Independence.* In the absence of the author the paper was read by his son, Harold H. Schaff, Instructor in History at Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. The paper was discussed by Messrs. Rockwell and Kieffer.

The third paper was by Arthur Adams, of Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., on the subject *The Two Editions of Cyprian's De Ecclesiæ Unitate.* It was discussed by Dr. Richards.

The fourth and last paper of the morning was that of Frank Eakin, of the Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pa., and bore the title *Some Ideas and Queries about Teaching Church History.* In the discussion of the subject the following took part: Messrs. Nichols, Richards, Rockwell, and H. H. Walker.

The Treasurer, Prof. Nichols, requested that a committee be appointed to audit his accounts for the fiscal year and report at the afternoon session. The President appointed Messrs. Wentz and Garrison.

At 1:15 P.M., the Society and its guests adjourned to take luncheon, according to arrangements previously made by W. W. Rockwell, the Committee on Local Arrangements, at the Faculty Club of Columbia University, at 400 117th Street, New York.

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Society re-convened for the afternoon at about 3:30. In addition to those present at the morning session, the

following responded to the roll call: Harry E. Stocker, New York City; A. Steimle, New York City; W. G. G. Scherer, New York City; Charles E. Corwin, Ocean Grove, N. J.; G. U.Wenner, New York City; Alfred J. Sadler, Jersey City; and H. H. Tryon, New York City.

The Society then transacted the business of the annual meeting as follows:

The Minutes of the last annual meeting of the Society, held December 28, 1925, were read and on motion approved as read.

The Minutes of the Special Literary Meeting of the Society held at St. Louis on April 2 and 3, 1926, were read and approved as read.

The Society requested Prof. Nichols to prepare a statement of our greetings to the forthcoming session of the Society at Chicago in March, 1927, and of our gratification at the success of these Midwest Literary Meetings of the last two years. Prof. Nichols later sent the Secretary the following statement, which the Secretary was ordered to transmit to the March meeting of the Society:

The Society has heard with much interest and gratification the report of the successful meeting of the Literary Session of the Society at St. Louis, on April 2 and 3, 1926, and sends to the forthcoming Literary Session in Chicago, in March, 1927, its cordial greetings and wishes for yet greater prosperity.

The Committee appointed earlier in the day to audit the accounts of the Treasurer, reported through its Chairman, A. R. Wentz, that it examined the accounts and found them correct. The Committee commended the Treasurer for the neatness and accuracy of his work.

The report of the Treasurer is as follows:

Report of the Treasurer of the American Society of Church History for the Year, December 19, 1925, to December 18, 1926.

CURRENT FUNDS ACCOUNT

Receipts

Balance on hand, December 19, 1925		$1188.27
Dues for Active Membership		
1923— 1 member	$ 3.00	
1924— 3 members	9.00	
1925— 12 members	36.00	
1926— 141 members	423.20	
1927— 13 members	39.00	
	510.20	510.20
Dues for Sustaining Membership:		
1926—3 members	30.00	30.00
Sale of *Papers*		18.00
Contributions for publication of *Papers*		25.00
Society Luncheon excess		.50
Replacement of check returned		6.00
Total		$1777.97

Disbursements

Printing	$ 88.11	
Stationery	8.69	
Postage	43.22	
Stenographers' services	35.35	
Refund for check returned	6.00	
Total	181.37	181.37
Cash in National Bank of Auburn, Dec. 18, 1926, as per bank statement		1596.60
Total		$1777.67

ENDOWMENT FUND ACCOUNT

Total of Fund, Dec. 18, 1925	$ 972.18
Interest, Auburn Savings Bank	38.24
Cash in Auburn Savings Bank, Dec. 18, 1926	$1010.42

Respectfully submitted,
ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS,
Treasurer.

Examined and found correct.
Attest: A. R. WENTZ
W. E. GARRISON } *Committee of Auditors.*

The Society received and adopted this report and ordered it published in the forthcoming volume of our *Papers*.

The Society heard the report of the Secretary in regard to the actions taken by the Council since the last annual meeting of the Society, and on motion these were approved.

The Society received the nominations made by the Council for officers and committee appointments for the next year and adopted these recommendations, voting that the Secretary be instructed to cast a ballot for these nominees, whereupon the President declared these nominees elected to their several offices and places on the committees. (For the list of these newly elected persons, see the Minutes of the Council of this same date.)

On motion Dr. Rockwell was given authority to arrange for the publication of the late Dr. Samuel M. Jackson's translation of the Letters of Servatus Lupus, in consultation with the executors of Dr. Jackson, it being understood that the Society will be under no financial obligation for this work.

The amendment to the Constitution, Article VI, Section 1, submitted at the last annual meeting by Dr. Rockwell, and the amendment to this proposed amendment submitted by Dr. Nichols, were taken up as the order for the day,

but after brief discussion of the matter—the changing of the annual dues to $5 or $4— it was unanimously decided to lay the proposed amendments on the table.

The Secretary was instructed to convey to Prof. A. H. Newman, of Mercer University, Macon, Ga., through President R. W. Weaver of this University, the congratulations of the Society and its best wishes on the occasion of the semi-centennial celebration of his career, as a teacher of history.

Various Committees reported to the Society in regard to their work during the year.

The thanks of the Society to Union Theological Seminary for its kind hospitality were voted, and the Secretary was instructed to transmit them to the President of the Seminary.

The Seminary then resumed its literary session. Owing to lack of time there was no discussion of the papers.

The first paper was by Abdel Ross Wentz, of the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., on the subject *The Work of Samuel Simon Schmucker.*[1]

The next paper was by Arthur B. Rhinow, of Brooklyn, N. Y., the subject being *The Pastor and Church History.*

The last paper was by Charles E. Corwin, of Ocean Grove, N. J., on the subject *Efforts of the Early Dutch Pastors for the Conversion of the Negro Slaves.*

On motion the Society adjourned at about 6 o'clock.

Attest: Frederick William Loetscher,
Secretary.

[1] Published in *The Lutheran Quarterly*, Jan., 1927.

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE COUNCIL, DECEMBER 27, 1926

IN accordance with a previous announcement by the President of the Society, the Council met in Room 209, Union Theological Seminary, New York City, on Monday, December 27, 1926, at 2:50 P.M., President W. W. Rockwell in the chair.

The other members present were Messrs. Case, Loetscher, Nichols, Richards, and Schwarze. On motion the following were excused for absence, Messrs. Washburn and Worcester.

The Minutes of the last meeting of the Council, December 28, 1925, were read and on motion approved as read.

Attention was called by the Treasurer to the fact that Messrs. Correll and Tetlie, who had been elected at the meeting in December, 1925, had not been heard from, and the Council thereupon declared that they were not eligible to enrollment as members.

The Council accepted with regret the resignations of P. W. Mosher and O. M. Norlie as members of the Society.

On motion the following were dropped from the list of members for non-payment of annual dues for three years: Arthur S. Hirsch and J. F. Krueger.

The Secretary reported that all the members of the Council had voted affirmatively in response to his inquiry by circular letter in regard to the election to membership of Prof. E. W. Parsons, D.D., of Rochester Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y., and the Council thereupon formally elected him into membership.

On motions duly made and carried with respect to the several nominees, the following were elected as members of the Society:

Rev. Robert N. Brooks, Gammon Theological Seminary, South Atlanta, Ga.
Rev. Henry D. Frost, Huguenot Park, Staten Island, N. Y.
Rev. Paul N. Garber, Ph.D., Duke University, N. C.
Prof. Peter Guilday, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.
Prof. Henry Katterjohn, Elmhurst College, Elmhurst, Ill.
Mr. Maurice Levanoux, 118 23d St., Jackson Heights, New York.
Prof. Donald McFayden, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.
Rev. Thomas B. Mather, Marshall, Mo.
Mr. John F. Moore, International Y. M. C. A., 347 Madison Ave., New York City.
Rev. John B. Moose, Ph.D., Lutheran Theological Seminary, Maywood, Ill.
Rev. Edward H. Niles, 8321 Vietor Place, Elmhurst, Long Island, N. Y.
Prof. Wm. G. Polack, Concordia Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.
Prof. Plato E. Shaw, Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn.
Miss Lucy Simmons, State Teachers College, Kirksville, Mo.
Rev. S. Harrison Thomson, Ph.D., Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.

The Council decided to recommend the following persons to be elected by the Society as officers and members of committees:

President, George Warren Richards;
Vice-President, Winfred Ernest Garrison;
Secretary, Frederick William Loetscher;
Treasurer, Robert Hastings Nichols.

Former Presidents as Members of Council

Henry Bradford Washburn, George Edwin Horr, Robert Hastings Nichols, Ephraim Emerton, William Nathaniel Schwarze, James Coffin Stout, Henry Jacob Weber, John Alfred Faulkner, Shirley Jackson Case, and William Walker Rockwell.

Elected Members of Council

Otto Hermann Pannkoke, Edward Strong Worcester.

Editorial Committee: W. W. Rockwell, Chairman; S. J. Case, the Secretary, the Treasurer.

Membership Committee: W. W. Rockwell, Chairman; S. J. Case, W. D. Schermerhorn, the Secretary, the Treasurer.

Committee on Endowment: O. H. Pannkoke, Chairman; W. W. Rockwell, H. B. Washburn, the Secretary.

Committee on Investment of Endowment Funds: R. H. Nichols, Chairman; K. D. Macmillan, G. W. Richards.

Committee on Western Meeting, March, 1927: W. D. Schermerhorn, Chairman; C. E. Schneider, M. Spinka.

Committee on Financing Publications: H. J. Weber, Chairman; W. E. Garrison. Dr. Worcester, former Chairman of this Committee, was, at his urgent request, relieved of his duties on this Committee. The Committee was reconstituted as above, and was given power to add to its number.

On motion the Council adjourned, to meet, if necessary, at the call of the President.

Attest: FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER,
Secretary.

LITERARY MEETING AT CHICAGO, MARCH, 1927

THE American Society of Church History met for a special literary session in Swift Hall, University of Chicago, in the afternoon of Friday, March 25, 1927, at 2:10 o'clock. In the absence of the President, the meeting was called to order by the Vice-President of the Society, W. E. Garrison. Prayer was offered by Andrew B. Baird.

The following members of the Society were present: J. B. Moose, C. E. Schneider, S. J. Case, A. B. Baird, W. W. Sweet, W. D. Schermerhorn, A. A. Hays, C. H. Lyttle, J. L. Neve, M. Spinka, H. H. Walker, W. E. Garrison, and A. W. Nagler. The following were present as guests: W. Pauck, E. Lauer, F. I. Moats, R. Burton, J. Morgenstern, G. A. Henry, C. B. Swaney, and V. L. Schwalm.

AFTERNOON SESSION

By reason of the absence of the Secretary of the Society, a temporary Secretary was elected in the person of Matthew Spinka.

W. D. Schermerhorn, Chairman of the Program Committee, called attention to a few changes and corrections of the printed program, and then read a letter of greetings from the Secretary of the Society, F. W. Loetscher.

The order of the program of Friday afternoon was changed in so far as V. L. Schwalm's paper was to be read in place of R. P. Rider's, for the former found it necessary to leave on Friday evening.

S. J. Case announced that the members of the Society were to be guests of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago at dinner to be given in the private room of the Quadrangle Club.

Thereupon, the Vice-President introduced the first speaker of the afternoon, Julian Morgenstern, President of the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio, who read a paper on *Modern Judaism*, thus changing the title of the address originally announced as "American Judaism." Messrs. Baird, Walker, and Garrison engaged in the discussion of the paper.

Francis I. Moats, of Simpson College, Indianola, Iowa, read a very interesting paper on *The Educational Renaissance in the Methodist Church.*

At 3:45, a recess of ten minutes was taken.

After the recess, William W. Sweet, of De Pauw University, Greencastle, Indiana, read an instructive paper on *Some Religious Aspects of the Kansas Struggle.*

Following that, Vernon L. Schwalm, of Manchester College, North Manchester, Indiana, read a paper on *Denominational Colleges in the Old North West, 1820–1870.*

In the discussion of the three papers which now became the order of the day, the following persons took part: Messrs. Schneider, Walker, Schwalm, Sweet, Henry, Moats, Garrison, Schermerhorn, Baird.

After another announcement made by Professor Case, regarding the complimentary dinner given the members of the Society by the Divinity School, the session was adjourned.

EVENING SESSION

The evening session was opened by the Vice-President, W. E. Garrison, at 7:30. The first speaker of the evening was Andrew B. Baird, Principal of Manitoba College, Winnipeg, Canada, who read an instructive paper on *The Symbolic Use of the Cross in Early Christianity.* This address was followed by stereoptican pictures illustrative of the theme, and by an exhibition of rare Byzantine coins.

The second paper of the evening was read by George A. Henry, of Wesley College, Grand Forks, N. Dakota, on the

subject *Marcus Aurelius and the Religious Life of His Time.*

Because of the lateness of the hour, it was decided that the business session precede the discussion of the papers read. The business session centered about the theme, "How to Find and Classify Unpublished Sources of American Church History in the Middle West." It was engaged in by Messrs. Spinka, Schneider, Sweet, and Case. The trend of the discussion was two-fold: M. Spinka reported upon the work done by P. G. Mode in sending out a questionnaire to a large number of seminary, college, and university libraries, and collecting the replies. On the whole, this method proved unsatisfactory, for the largest collections were not itemized. In view of that fact, it was suggested that the best method of carrying on the work is that of personal visit of a research scholar to the various depositories of source material.

Moreover, M. Spinka suggested that a territorially representative research committee be appointed, which would supervise the research work in the various states.

C. E. Schneider's report dealt with the work accomplished and planned for in the state of Missouri. He had secured the co-operation of the St. Louis Church Federation, and had also tentatively secured a promise of co-operation in collecting and classifying the Missouri church history source material from the administration of the Jefferson Memorial Library.

It was furthermore moved and adopted that a committee to nominate members of the Program Committee, of a standing Research Committee, and a permanent Secretary for literary meetings, be appointed, the Committee on Research to consist of five members, with power to constitute subcommittees. The chair appointed the following members as the nominating committee: W. D. Schermerhorn, Chairman; V. L. Schwalm, and J. B. Moose.

The meeting was then adjourned.

MORNING SESSION

March 26, 1927

The meeting on Saturday was called to order by the Vice-President, W. E. Garrison, at 8:30 A.M.

The first paper was read by Charles B. Swaney of Upper Iowa University, Fayette, Iowa, on *The General Conference of 1844 in the Methodist Episcopal Church.* The paper was discussed by Messrs. Moats, Sweet, Garrison, and Schermerhorn.

Then followed an address by Wilhelm Pauck, of the Chicago Theological Seminary, on *Martin Bucer's Conception of the Christian State.* It was discussed by Messrs. Garrison and Case.

In the business session which followed, J. B. Moose reported in behalf of the nominating committee the following recommendations:

Program Committee:	S. J. Case, Chairman; Messrs. A. A. Hays and J. H. Horstmann.
Research Committee:	W. W. Sweet, Chairman for Illinois; Carl E. Schneider, Chairman for Missouri; Francis I. Moats, Chairman for Iowa; J. O. Evjen, Chairman for Ohio; Vernon L. Schwalm, Chairman for Indiana.

The Committee was given power to appoint commissioners from other states.

Secretary: Dr. Matthew Spinka.

The report was adopted, and the committees were pronounced elected.

The duties of the Secretary were then further defined by a motion made by H. H. Walker and seconded by W. W. Sweet and adopted, "that the Secretary serve as secretary

of the research committee." Further, a motion was duly carried that "the Society at its annual business meeting in New York be petitioned that the Secretary, Dr. Matthew Spinka, be appointed an assistant secretary of the Society, to function as Secretary of the Western Literary Meetings." This motion was likewise adopted.

Invitations to entertain the Western Literary Meeting at its next annual session were extended by H. H. Walker in behalf of the Chicago Theological Seminary, and W. D. Schermerhorn in behalf of the Garrett Biblical Institute. It was moved and adopted that the decision as to the place and time of the next annual literary meeting be left in the hands of the Program Committee.

Professor Case then gave a brief report concerning the last annual business meeting of the Society held in New York, in which he called attention to the deviation from the usual course by the election of a representative of the Western membership to the office of Vice-President, in the person of W. E. Garrison.

Reading of papers was thereupon resumed. Carl E. Schneider read an interesting paper, prepared by Mr. R. P. Rider, of the Missouri Baptist Historical Association, Liberty, Missouri, on *The Pioneer Period in the History of the Baptists in Missouri.* Mr. Rider is a layman, 90 years of age, and the appreciation of his interest in the work of the Society was manifested by the passing of a motion instructing the Secretary to send Mr. Rider a letter of greetings and appreciation on behalf of the Society.

Thereupon, H. H. Walker, of the Chicago Theological Seminary, read an instructive paper on *Some Aspects of Seventeenth Century Rationalism in England.*

Discussion which followed was shared by the lecturer and Messrs. Lyttle, Garrison, Lauer, Schneider.

The last speaker on the program was Ernest F. Lauer, of the Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, who

read a paper on the theme of *Some Religious Aspects of Naturalism*.

It was moved and seconded to extend a vote of thanks to the Divinity School of the University of Chicago for the hospitality and kindness shown the Society. The motion was unanimously adopted.

The session was concluded by a prayer offered by A. A. Hays.

Attest: MATTHEW SPINKA,
Secretary.

The Early Christian Sarcophagi of the Lateran Museum and Their Historical Suggestiveness

By
James Coffin Stout

THE EARLY CHRISTIAN SARCOPHAGI OF THE LATERAN MUSEUM AND THEIR HISTORICAL SUGGESTIVENESS

By James Coffin Stout, D.D., Professor of Church History in the Biblical Seminary, New York City

(*The Presidential Address, read December 30, 1923*)

IN the Lateran Museum at Rome perhaps the largest and most interesting collection of ancient Christian sarcophagi in the world has been gathered together. It is hard to say just how many different specimens are represented. At least thirty-eight are more or less complete; and there are, besides, numerous fragments of others, some of which have doubtless been reckoned in the larger estimates sometimes given. A few were found in the various catacombs which like the encampments of a besieging army encircle the walls of Rome. The majority came from the early basilicas, which sprang up so rapidly after Constantine's Edict had proclaimed that the victory of these Christian hosts had indeed been won. It would be difficult to assign an exact date to many of these sarcophagi; but in general it may be said that they represent the fourth and fifth centuries, with a few specimens from still earlier generations, and a few others which reach forward into the sixth century.

Two facts lend a peculiar interest to these treasures from the early period of the Christian Church: first, the notably important era which they represent; and second, the fact that they are themselves primary historical "sources." For the historian here are veritable "sermons in stones," voices which, without word or comment, and unhindered by the lapse of time, give an intelligible and original witness. And

the testimony which they bear is in regard to those centuries which saw the magnificent heroism of the days of Diocletian become only a glorious memory; centuries which witnessed the prolonged struggle against Arianism and the varying forms of the Christological Controversy; centuries which developed Cyprian's assertion of the essential character of the ecclesiastical organization and of the episcopal supremacy into Augustine's doctrine of the objective, visible Church, and prepared the way for Gregory the Great and the Medieval Papacy; centuries which were so rich in great Christian leaders, and so full of crises which arose with respect to either the doctrine, or the organization, or the cultus of the Church, that it would be useless, in this brief paper, to try to catalogue them.

With respect to these notable centuries the sarcophagi of the Lateran Museum are not later interpretations; they are contemporary records. They are themselves historical facts—facts which reveal the content of the Christian faith as that faith was focused upon the mystery of death, and a believer was delivered from the struggles of the Church Militant and translated into the blessedness of the Church Triumphant.

In passing let us notice that it would seem to be vital to any just appraisal of the meaning of these sarcophagi to be always bearing in mind the fact that they were indeed instruments of burial. They reflect thoughts which would be natural to such a time. And therefore they ought not to be interpreted theoretically, but practically and personally. Some such question as this should always be uppermost: —Given the conditions of the age represented, what would be apt to be the beliefs, the aspirations and hopes which would be recorded as the body of a believer was laid to rest? And in this question is to be found genuine historical interest. For as these sarcophagi reflect the beliefs of their age, through them it may be possible to read back again to those

beliefs. And thus they may become witnesses not only to details of the Christian faith then current, but also to the historic movements which were both accompanying and developing them.

This paper can make no attempt at a complete discussion of the questions involved in the interpretation of these ancient memorials. Naturally enough, in the midst of much that is transparently clear, there are obscure points about which differences of opinion have arisen. It is not within the purpose of the present reader, nor, indeed, is it within his ability, to assume to arbitrate these differences. Rather, the object of this paper is the more modest one of merely calling renewed attention to the value of these early historical sources, and through the mention of but two of the points concerning which interpreters have disagreed, to suggest the possibility of deeper study.

Both of these moot points are illustrated in the large sarcophagus (No. 104) which stands at the foot of the stairs as one enters the handsome hall in which the collection has been installed. This particular sarcophagus has been identified as of the fifth century, and comes from the Ostian Basilica of St. Paul's. As is the case with many others, it is adorned with a double row of sculptured figures, arranged in groups which illustrate Biblical incidents.

It is really quite surprising what a variety of Scriptural scenes are depicted on these sarcophagi. And it is also interesting to notice which scenes seem to have been the most popular. Among the most frequent, perhaps the most frequent of all, is the story of Jonah, set forth in three, or sometimes four scenes, which are usually blended into a single group. Its appropriateness to the hour of burial is evident in view of our Lord's having made Jonah a type of his own resurrection. Perhaps also Jonah's mission as preacher of the divine message in the heathen city of Nineveh symbolized to these early Christians their own lives

of witness-bearing in the Nineveh of Rome. The raising of Lazarus, again focusing faith on the resurrection, is also often found. Moses striking the rock, with two diminutive Israelites catching the descending water in their mouths, was a favorite group; probably reminding of St. Paul's statement that "that rock was Christ," and expressing assurance that Christ had refreshed the departed one throughout his wilderness journey towards the heavenly Canaan. Daniel among the lions appears again and again; perhaps suggesting the need which in these cases had existed for specially heroic fidelity, as well as God's deliverance of His servants from the fierceness of their struggle. It may be worth noting in connection with this group that there is usually the figure of a man who is offering Daniel bread, seemingly drawing from the apocryphal elements in the story. As we might expect, a variety of the miracles of our Lord are represented; and many other Biblical scenes whose appropriateness to a sarcophagus is sometimes more, sometimes less, understandable.

In comparatively recent days a very interesting and very probable theory in regard to many of these sarcophagus groups has been developed, especially by Le Blant, in his *Etude sur les sarcophages chrétiens de la ville d'Arles*, and Victor Schultze, in his *Archäologische Studien* and *Archäologie der altchristlichen Kunst.* Allow me to quote a few sentences from Walter Lowrie's *Monuments of the Early Church* (pp. 198–200) in regard to the work of these two men.

> Starting with the observation that the phraseology of many early epitaphs seemed to be derived from the liturgy of the Church, the suggestion lay very near that the pictorial themes also might have been inspired from the same source. It proved, in fact, very easy to show a relation between the themes of Christian sepulchral art and the funeral liturgies, which is altogether too complete and too precise to be fortuitous. Le

Blant referred especially to the prayers in the Roman Breviary which commend the soul to God in the hour of death. . . . Schultze quotes as the Classical example a passage from the *Apostolic Constitutions* (Book V, 7): "He who raised Lazarus on the fourth day and the daughter of Jairus and the son of the widow, and rose also himself; who after three days brought forth Jonah living and unharmed from the belly of the whale, and the three children from the furnace of Babylon, and Daniel from the mouth of the lions, shall not lack power to raise us also. He who raised the paralytic, and healed him who had the withered hand, and restored the lacking faculty to him who was born blind, the same shall raise us also. He who with five loaves and two fishes fed five thousand and had twelve baskets over, and who changed the water into wine, and who sent the stater which he took out of the mouth of the fish to those who demanded tribute by the hand of me Peter, the same shall also raise the dead."

In these texts there are included the majority of the subjects which were commonly employed in the adornment of the catacombs and of the sarcophagi, and there can be no doubt that it was this argument of deliverance from death by the almighty power of God which accounts for the selection of these signal instances of deliverance and their monotonous repetition in early Christian art.

But the interest of this paper centers in two scenes whose significance has been quite definitely disputed. In the upper left hand corner of the large sarcophagus just mentioned is a group of three aged, bearded men, with features which are so nearly alike as to suggest the possibility that they were intended to be identical. One is seated on a chair, or perhaps it should be thought of as a throne. The other two stand, one behind the chair, the other beside the man who is seated thereon. This second standing figure has his hand on the head of a diminutive and entirely nude individual, while prone upon the ground lies another small figure, also nude. Dr. Northcote, in his *Roma Sotteranea* (in which, in collabo-

ration with W. R. Brownlow, he has brought within the reach of the English reader many of the results of De Rossi's monumental work, also entitled *Roma Sotteranea*), interprets this as the creation of Eve from the side of the sleeping Adam; the three bearded men representing the Trinity, the one seated being "the Eternal Father, the source and fountain of Deity," the one behind the chair, the Holy Ghost, and the one at the side with his hand upon the head of Eve, the Eternal Word. On the other hand, Dr. Withrow, in his book entitled *The Catacombs of Rome*, with considerable insistence contests this interpretation. The real animus of his objection is his eagerness to prove that—to use his own words—"it was long before the most audacious hand dared to represent in painting or sculpture the omnipotent Jehovah or the infinite Spirit, who sustain and pervade the universe." And obsessed by a great horror of the idolatrous character of later Roman Catholic art, he takes his stand with much positiveness against Dr. Northcote's whole interpretation.

It would exceed the proper limits of this paper to review the details of Dr. Withrow's zealously anti-Catholic argument; some of which details might possibly appear rather trivial, and the sum total quite unconvincing. His main contention, in regard to the refusal of early Christian art to depict the Deity, is, indeed, fortified by the numerous instances on the sarcophagi of the representation of Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac, in which the restraining interposition of God is suggested merely by a hand, never by a figure, much less by the features of a face. But, *per contra*, it certainly seems to be negatived both by the Cain and Abel groups of these same sarcophagi, in which these two men, Cain and Abel, come presenting their respective gifts to a similarly seated, bearded figure (No. 193 and No. 164), apparently intended for the Deity, and also by at least one of the groups representing Adam and Eve after their sin, in which a figure, again bearded, is laying an admonishing hand on

Adam's shoulder (No. 155), manifestly none other than Jehovah God.

But, after all, the historical suggestiveness of this group, so differently interpreted by Northcote and Withrow, is more immediate than this or that theory in respect to religious art, because of its possible testimony to the adherence of those interred in this sarcophagus—a man and his wife—to the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity. De Rossi claims it as one of eight examples in early Christian art which have reference to this doctrine. Northcote, as we have seen, endorses this position. And Lowrie, in his *Monuments of the Early Church* (p. 259), says, "These figures must be taken to represent the Trinity, although the subject is absolutely unique in Christian art." The representation of the holy Trinity through this Creation scene, with its three separate and distinct persons whose essential unity is yet suggested by their identity of countenance, may or may not have been a part of the original intention of this group. But it is at least an interesting historical possibility that there is here an indirect and approximately contemporary reflection of that lamentable conflict which destroyed the peace of the Church for the half-century from Nicea to Constantinople, and whose aftermath of theological disturbance extended into the following century—the century from which this sarcophagus dates.

The second of our two points brings us into touch with a problem of an entirely different sort, the question of the primacy of the Bishop of Rome as the successor of St. Peter, the "Prince of the Apostles." Dr. Northcote, basing his position on the testimony of two pieces of gilded glass found in the catacombs, on which the name of Peter appears beside a figure of a man striking a rock, argues that in the groups on the sarcophagi which represent Moses bringing water from the rock, Moses in reality is only a symbol for Peter. He implies that in these groups faith was not think-

ing of Moses, or even primarily of Christ—although he recognizes St. Paul's statement that "that rock was Christ" —but of the Apostle Peter. He cites Prudentius to the effect that St. Peter was considered the Moses of the Israel of God, and quotes St. Macarius of Egypt, in the words, "Moses was succeeded by Peter, to whom is committed the new Church of Christ, and the new priesthood." Then, he goes on, "It is not without reason that in the sarcophagi the figure striking the rock is almost invariably found in immediate juxtaposition with the Prince of the Apostles led captive by the satellites of Herod Agrippa, and there is frequently a studied similarity in the features of the principal figure in both scenes. The most striking example of this is in the large sarcophagus which stands at the end of the principal hall in the Lateran Museum." (That is, the one to which I am calling attention.) "In one of the four compartments into which the front of that sarcophagus is divided, we have an epitome of St. Peter's life. First, he stands with the rod of power already given to him by his Divine Master, who is warning him of his fall, symbolized by the cock at his feet. Next, he is taken prisoner by the satellites of Agrippa, but he still bears the rod, for 'the Word of God is not bound,' and no worldly violence can wrench the rod of jurisdiction from him to whom Christ has given it. Lastly, he appears under the symbol of Moses, using the rod to bring from 'the spiritual Rock' the streams of grace, at which the Israel of God slake the thirst of their souls."

Along with this, in a footnote, Dr. Northcote develops that other interesting theory which has its bearing on Peter's traditional residence at Rome. In speaking of the group which he thinks represents the arrest of Peter by the emissaries of Herod, which is one of the most frequent of all the groups of the sarcophagi, he says: "There must have been some special cause for the frequent repetition of this scene. The most reasonable explanation is, that St. Peter's

imprisonment and miraculous deliverance, after which 'he went into another place'—Acts 12:17—was the occasion of his coming to Rome, where the same scene was enacted again and again in the apprehension and martyrdom of so many of his successors."

First of all, let us admit that chronologically there is a certain possibility of finding on these sarcophagi a reflection of the increasing tendency to exalt the Apostle Peter to the spiritual primacy of the Church. It was during these very centuries that this belief rapidly crystallized. Let us also recognize that before the era represented by these sarcophagi had ended, the belief in Peter's residence at Rome and his long rule as the first bishop of the Roman see, had become so widespread that a gigantic ecclesiastical mechanism was in process of construction, which owed its origin solely to these assumed facts. Doubtless these two theories, of Peter's residence at Rome and of his spiritual primacy, are to this day matters of debate. But however convincedly they may be received or denied, asserted or disbelieved, as historians we are bound to recognize the powerful influence which their acceptance has exerted upon developments within the Church. Whether or not the theories are true to fact, we are profoundly interested in their influence upon what we know to be true historic fact. Hence we acknowledge the attractiveness of this linking of the testimony of these early sarcophagi to the tendency of the times to accept these views.

But having taken cognizance of this, let us notice that certain questions inevitably obtrude upon one's mind. Dr. Northcote himself allows for exceptions in his twofold assertion that "the figure striking the rock is *almost* invariably in immediate juxtaposition with the Prince of the Apostles led captive by the satellites of Herod Agrippa," and that "there is *frequently* a studied similarity in the features of the principal figure in both scenes." It may not be unwise nor

unscientific to ask, Are these exceptions important enough to suggest hesitance in accepting his main contention?

As I have shown, he also connects with these scenes the group in which Peter is standing by his Divine Master, with the cock at his feet, symbol of the warning against his impending fall. Is *this* group *usually* connected with these other two scenes? and, if so, are the features of Peter in each case the same in all three scenes? It would seem that this will probably be the case if this theory is to be maintained. In the Denial group, that is, the one with the cock, the central figure is of course intended for Peter. Of this there can be no doubt. But the identification of Peter with the principals in the other groups, especially as symbolized by Moses in the bringing of water from the rock,—this identification is not so self-evident, and to a certain extent is conditioned upon this similarity of features. Do the sarcophagi, other than the one which Dr. Northcote has cited, bear out this theory?

It would only weary you if I should enter upon a thorough discussion of the details of this question. At this time it will be sufficient to point out that whereas on *one* other sarcophagus (No. 109) the three scenes again occur in immediate juxtaposition and with a more or less noticeable similarity in the features of the central figures, there are *three* others (Nos. 155, 175, 178) on which the Denial scene is not only separated from the other two by groups of an entirely different character, but the features of Peter are also dissimilar both to those of Moses and to the man who is being arrested. In another instance (No. 184), the three groups once more appear but in far separated positions on the sarcophagus—apparently having no relation to one another—and whereas the features are mutually similar, their resemblance to each other is no more striking than it is to several other elderly men in the other groups on this same sarcophagus, who are certainly not intended for Peter. Moreover, on sarcophagus

No. 116 the Arrest scene is in juxtaposition, not with Moses at the rock, but with Abraham in the act of offering up Isaac—another of the favorite sarcophagus groups—and the faces of the central figures are again noticeably similar, that is, the man being arrested in this case looks surprisingly like *Abraham;* while the face of Peter in the scene with the cock, which is also on this sarcophagus, bears absolutely no resemblance either to Abraham or to the man being arrested.

Possibly this is enough to justify the question, Is there not some other interpretation which is at least as likely to be the correct one as this essentially ecclesiastical theory of Northcote's? And once more it would seem to be worth while to recall that these sarcophagi were instruments of burial, and that, therefore, the key to their interpretation is probably of an individual and personal character. From this point of view, what could these three scenes have signified?

It is interesting to notice that the group representing Peter's denial not only occurs with marked frequency, but also that on at least two sarcophagi (Nos. 138, 152) it is made conspicuous by being placed in the exact center, and that on still another (No. 154) it attains even greater prominence through being not only in the center, but the only group of any kind whatsoever that is depicted thereon. One can hardly avoid asking, What is suggested by this grouping of Jesus, and Peter and the cock which might carry such a compelling appeal to the hearts of believers in the hour of bereavement and of the committal of the bodies of their departed to the earth? Lowrie's explanation is interesting, though not completely convincing. He says (p. 260): "It is strange that the fall of Peter was represented so often upon Roman monuments. The special interest of this scene probably lay in the fact that it afforded a justification of the Catholic practice—hotly contested by certain sectarians of readmitting to the Church through penance those who had lapsed by the denial of their religion in order to escape

martyrdom." But a lapse from the faith in order to escape martyrdom, even though restoration had followed, hardly seems to be the kind of memory which bereaved relatives or friends would choose to make permanent on the caskets of their loved ones. Pressensé, *Christian Life and Practice in the Early Church*, pp. 494, 511, seems to interpret with deeper understanding, when, in writing of the inscriptions and art of the Catacombs, he says: "The Catacombs show us the inner life of the Christians in all its simplicity, as it sought expression in its hour of deepest grief. The voice we hear is not that of a bishop or doctor speaking *ex cathedra*, but of Rachel weeping for her children, of Martha and Mary by the grave of Lazarus pouring forth at once their sorrow and their hope." And with special reference to these Denial groups, he says: "The Christians remind themselves of watchfulness and the shame of falling away by representations of Peter's denial."

But even this view, which softens the harshness of Lowrie's suggestion, inasmuch as it avoids all implication that the deceased had actually apostatized under persecution, seems almost too aggressively didactic—too remote from the "expression of the inner life of the Christians in all its simplicity in its hour of deepest grief." Is there perhaps a still more sympathetic viewpoint, which may yet be within the broad region of possibility?

As a mere suggestion—for it is no part of the present reader's purpose to assert positive convictions—as a sort of working hypothesis with which to approach not only this group, but the others mentioned by Dr. Northcote as well, may it be that those interred in the several sarcophagi on which this Denial scene appears were known to have suffered some peculiarly poignant temptation, through which they had been "sifted as wheat," and yet that their faith had *not* failed? May it be that in the case of this particular sarcophagus (No. 104) this extreme test may even

have taken the form of forcible arrest for Christ's sake, and that Christ, their Rock, had continually satisfied their afflicted souls with streams of abundant grace? At the same time, it is, of course, more than probable that, both to the deceased and to their survivors, the comfort of the thought of a faith which did not fail under severe trial may have been enhanced by the knowledge that the great Apostle himself had also passed through a similar experience.

Some such *personal* interpretation, based on spiritual kinship, the possession of "a like precious faith" with Peter, their brother in the Lord, is understandable. But it is not so clear how this particular scene, this *Denial* scene, could have been considered markedly appropriate as a testimony to faith in the ecclesiastical primacy of Peter the Bishop of Rome, even to the extent of its being selected to stand alone, the only record of any kind on a sarcophagus. The underlying difficulty of this contention is indirectly recognized by Lowrie's sentence added to his interpretation already quoted: "This cannot be intended, at all events, as a derogation of Peter's primacy, which was generally recognized in the fourth century."

I am well aware of the unsatisfactory character of this paper owing to the entire absence of positive conclusions. This was inevitable in so brief a discussion, unless resort were had to dogmatic assertions unsupported by evidence or argument. But if renewed interest in these mute yet vocal sources of historical information has been aroused, the purpose of the paper will have been attained.

The Formal Dialectical Rationalism of Calvin

By

Henry Jacob Weber

THE FORMAL DIALECTICAL RATIONALISM OF CALVIN

By Henry Jacob Weber, Ph.D., D.D. Dean and Professor of Theology and Church History, Bloomfield Theological Seminary, Bloomfield, N. J.

(*The Presidential Address, read December 29, 1924*)

WHAT William Pierson Merrill[1] recently said of the Creed of the Presbyterian Church, i.e., that it is "comprehensive," is true also of the *Institutes* of Calvin: the work is an inclusive document; it comprehends varying, even conflicting views. Calvin endeavors to press "life and reality" into a system of harmonious thought. In its sixth edition of the *Institutes* the Presbyterian Board of Publication rightly affirms, that Calvin's great natural abilities, his profound erudition, his well-balanced and discriminating judgment . . . eminently fitted him to prepare such a work, in which the doctrines of the Gospel are so clearly developed and harmonized.

Williston Walker[2] says: The *Institutes* are, "the most orderly and systematic popular presentation of doctrine and of the Christian life that the Reformation produced"; and he discerns the peculiarity of Calvin when he asserts: "Calvin's mind was formulative, rather than creative." Much Calvin received from Luther and Bucer, but "all is systematized and clarified with a skill that was Calvin's own."

[1] See *The Continent*, N. Y., March 1, 1923 and *The Christian Work*, N. Y., pp. 555 *seq.*

[2] *A History of the Christian Church*, p. 392.

This evaluation of Calvin concurs with that of B. B. Warfield[1], who maintains that to John Calvin's "formative hand and systematizing talent the doctrinal system of Reformed Churches has perhaps owed most." And W. Hastie[2] even asserts that "Calvinism is the only system in which the whole order of the world is brought into a rational unity with the doctrine of grace."

In "Three Addresses delivered by Professors in Union Theological Seminary, May 3, 1909, on John Calvin," Professor W. W. Rockwell praises "the French logic and the lucid grasp of principle" as pre-eminent qualities of Calvin; Prof. W. A. Brown affirms that Calvin's mind "was clear and cogent," that his system is first and foremost the outgrowth of a personal religious experience, but also of a theory of the world, and that on the basis of this philosophy and of this experience Calvinism erects its ethical system; and Prof. Brown pithily comments that Calvin combined critical insight and constructive power in unusual degree, but that he was theologian first, and exegete secondly, and that he never allowed questions of detail to divert him from his main purpose—the clear statement of the central truths of the Gospel, as he understood them.

Why was it possible for Calvin to bring the whole order of the world into a rational unity with the doctrine of grace? Did he find this unity of thought in the Scriptures by examining the doctrines or statements of each book of the Bible inductively and in their historic setting? What enables him to harmonize as "very words of God himself" the exhortations to the Israelites in Deuteronomy to observe feasts and bring sacrifices, with the statement of Isaiah (i, 14), that the Word of God has come to him saying: "Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth. Incense is an abomination unto me"? Which statement shall we accept,

[1] B. B. Warfield, *The Princeton Review*, July, 1909.
[2] *Theology as a Science*, Glasgow, 1899, pp. 97f.

that in Matt. V, 38: "An eye for an eye and a tooth for tooth," or the admonition, Matt. v, 39: "Resist not him that is evil: but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also"; or again v, 44: "Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you; that ye may be sons of your Father, who is in heaven"?

Obviously Calvin's method is not always inductive or truly exegetical, carefully reproducing the times and the context of Scripture passages, so as to present the growth of religious insight and thought throughout the centuries involved in the writings of both the Old and New Testament; he is not a historian or exegete first of all; his mind is rather legalistic, formal and formative, ever striving to find a unity, and therefore omitting many valuable Scriptural truths.

Many earnest endeavors have been made to find a solution of the problem of Calvin's system of doctrine.

Philip Schaff[1] says: "Calvin was the best theologian and exegete among the Reformers. . . . He constructed with his logical genius the severest system of Protestant orthodoxy, and fortified it against Rationalism as well as against Romanism." And elsewhere Schaff remarks, that Calvin "was a consummate logician and dialectician, but also happily illogical, at least in one crucial point: by denying that God is the author of sin, which limits divine sovereignty." William Newton Clarke in his *Circle of Theology* says "that the thought of divine sovereignty, which has been exalted by Augustine at the expense of human freedom, received new form from the systematizing genius of Calvin; the result was a system strict, and logically consistent, magnifying God in his supreme control, but doing only partial justice either to the character of God as Christ revealed it, or to the freedom of man as manifested in human consciousness and history." Clarke clearly sees that Calvin

[1] *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. vi, p. 32.

is a logician, and also notes the partiality of Calvin's statements, and thus leads us on to find the real solution for the unique problem Calvin presents.

Herman Bauke,[1] finds three essential characteristics in the form of Calvin's theology. The first peculiarity is the formal-dialectical rationalism of Calvin's method of procedure in constructing his theological system. The second peculiarity is the *complexio oppositorum* of Calvin's theology. as Bauke terms it. By the way Williston Walker[2] rightly affirms this likewise of Augustine when he writes: "It is evident that, clear as was the system of Augustine in many respects, it contained profound contradictions. . . . He taught a predestination in which God sends grace to whom He will; yet he confined salvation to the visible church endowed with a sacramental ecclesiasticism. . . . His heart piety, also, saw the Christian life as one of personal relation to God in faith and love, yet he taught no less positively a legalistic and monastic asceticism. The Middle Age did not advance in these respects beyond Augustine. It did not reconcile his contradictions." And similarly Calvin's system did not advance beyond Augustine in reference to profound contradictions.

The third great characteristic of Calvin's system, according to Bauke, is his Biblicism; that is, his method of presenting the subject matter of his theology as coming forth from the Bible. This characteristic holds true more or less in reference to all theological systems; their religious, ethical, doctrinal statements, they all affirm, have been taken from the Bible. We receive and adopt the confessions of faith of our respective Churches "as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures." But that we may learn to comprehend Calvin's Biblicism, we must, I think, accept Bauke's differentiation between formal and material

[1] *Die Probleme der Theologie Calvins*, Leipzig, 1922.
[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 185.

Biblicism. We have long before this learned to speak of the Reformed Church as stressing the formal principle of the sixteenth century Reformation in saying: "The Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible"; whilst Luther uniquely emphasized the material principle, "justification by faith alone," thus grasping one of the essential doctrines of the New Testament. These two terms, formal and material Biblicism, Bauke employs to show how Calvin uses his Bible. "Material Biblicism" would then be that method of procedure which simply takes the subject matter of the Bible over into the system of theology. Over against this, "formal Biblicism" is that method of procedure which formally maintains that the presented system of theology is *de facto* basically a consistent representation of Biblical subject matter. This thought is the formal law, even if it can readily and frequently be proven that Bible and theological system are not in accord in Calvin's *Institutes*. Let me take an illustration from the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church. Chapter IV, "Of Creation," certainly desires to give the Biblical account of the creation of man. In Section ii it affirms: "After God had made all other creatures, he created man, male and female, with reasonable and immortal souls, endued with knowledge, righteousness and true holiness." The Shorter Catechism, Question 10, similarly states: "God created man, male and female, after his own image, in knowledge, righteousness and holiness." Is this proven from the Bible? Yes, formally, but not materially, really; the Scripture passages are truly taken from the Bible, but do not refer to Adam but to the new man, to the regenerated man, created through regeneration in righteousness and true holiness. See Col. iii, 10, and Eph. iv, 24, the passages used to prove an overstatement. Formal Biblicism is therefore that principle which claims to reproduce axiomatically Bible material in its system, without carefully considering

the context of Bible statements. The above statement in the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church is evidently based upon Calvin's statements in his *Institutes*, Book I, Chap. xv, where he unfolds his doctrine of "the state of man at his creation" in a philosophical rather than a truly exegetical way, when he affirms in his chapter on "The State of Man, at his Creation," the following:

No complete definition of this image, however, appears yet to be given, unless it be more clearly specified in what faculties man excels, and in what respects he ought to be accounted a mirror of the Divine glory. But that cannot be better known from any thing, than from the reparation of his corrupted nature. There is no doubt that Adam, when he fell from his dignity, was by this defection alienated from God. Wherefore, although we allow that the Divine image was not utterly annihilated and effaced in him, yet it was so corrupted that whatever remains is but horrible deformity. And therefore the beginning of our recovery and salvation is the restoration which we obtain through Christ, who on this account is called the second Adam; because he restores us to true and perfect integrity. For although Paul, opposing the quickening Spirit received by the faithful from Christ, to the living soul in which Adam was created, celebrates the degree of grace displayed in regeneration as superior to that manifested in creation, yet he contradicts not that other capital point, that this is the end of regeneration, that Christ may form us anew in the image of God. Therefore he elsewhere informs us, that "the new man is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him." With which corresponds the following exhortation: "Put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." Now, we may see what Paul comprehends in this renovation. In the first place, he mentions knowledge, and in the next place, sincere righteousness and holiness; whence we infer, that in the beginning the image of God was conspicuous in the light of the mind, in the rectitude of the heart and in the soundness of all the parts of our nature. For though I grant that the forms of expression are synecdochical, . . . yet this is an axiom which cannot be

overturned, that what holds the principal place in the renovation of the divine image, must also have held the same place in the creation of it at first."

Calvin is evidently convinced that the renewal of the Christians whereof Paul speaks in these two letters is the restoration of Adam's original character. Calvin concludes, therefore, from Ephesians iv, 24, and Colossians, iii, 10 that Adam was created in righteousness and holiness because the renovation is but a restoration of the original. The reference to a creation in righteousness and holiness of truth referred to by Paul, Calvin ignores altogether. A creation is not merely a renovation. Using logic Calvin might have concluded also that Christ is but a restoration of the first man, Adam.

Let us look at the context of both passages to ascertain whether a correct interpretation of the passages in question bears out the conclusion of Calvin that our Christian life in Christ is but a restoration of Adam's life before his fall, and that, therefore, Adam was not merely created with the capacity for righteousness and holiness, but with the possession of both before his lamented fall. In Ephesians iii Paul prays that Christ might dwell in the hearts of his readers, and that they might be found in love. In chapter iv he begs them to live a life worthy of their calling in love and unity, as Christians are all children of the same Father, even if the various members have different gifts and offices, so that the body of Christ, i.e. the Church, may be edified. Thus the whole Church, nourished by Christ, is perfected in love. From verse 17 on, Paul appeals to his hearers: Give up living like pagans, "lay aside the old nature which belonged to your former course of life, be renewed in the spirit of your mind, putting on the new nature, that divine pattern, which has been created in the upright and pious character of the truth" (Moffatt's translation); i.e. Paul

in verses 17–24, takes up the exhortation of verses 1–3 of the same chapter, pleading for a new life, for a life in Christ over against their former pagan life.

Dr. Abbott in his Commentary rightly questions the interpretation that the words translated "renewed," in Ephesians iv and Colossians iii, imply a restoration to a former estate, as Calvin and the Westminster Divines maintain; they hold that the Christian renovation is a renovation to the estate of the first Adam; but as the object of the verbs is "you"—referring to the readers—it is clear that Paul prays that his hearers may be changed, may become "new," that their spirit be renewed, or, as Bengel correctly interprets, that henceforth the higher life may be evident in them.

This interpretation invalidates Calvin's formal argument, that whereas Christians are renewed and created in righteousness and holiness, Adam also must have been originally created in righteousness and holiness.

I Calvin's Rationalism

The first peculiarity of Calvin's system is, as we have said, the formal-dialectical rationalism of his method of procedure. We do not accuse him of Rationalism in the historic sense of the word. He is not a Deist making reason the source and criterion of his theology; far from it. Calvin's rationalism is a purely formal rationalism, which does not in the least influence the content of his theology; this content he desires to take from the Bible. Calvin is a rationalist as to form, not as to content; he claims to have logic on his side; his method is generally logical, deductive. To-day we well know that logic is but a method, and that the perfect method ever and again employs induction and deduction, deduction and induction. The Calvinistic method is not scientific, historical, and logical to the extent that we might wish; it does not satisfactorily combine the two methods. Even where Calvin has received theological

thought from Luther, his formal presentation of it differs greatly from that of Luther, although the content may be identical. This formal rationalism is characteristic of Calvin's French, legalistic mind, and has come to be the vehicle of systematizing the various theological doctrines suggested by thoughts of the Scriptures, often misconstrued because the context of Scripture quotations is not carefully considered. Calvin's doctrine of the providence of God, for instance, is deeply religious and distinctly Christian, showing no trace of rationalism; he constantly antagonizes speculative philosophers; nevertheless, he persistently uses their formal method. Thus he treats the doctrine of justification Book III, Chap. xi. The subject of justification is to him "the principal hinge by which religion is supported. For unless we, first of all, apprehend in what situation we stand with respect to God, and what his judgment is concerning us, we have no foundation either for a certainty of salvation, or for the exercise of piety towards God." Calvin teaches: "He is said to be justified in the sight of God, who in the Divine judgment is reputed righteous. He is justified, who is considered not as a sinner, but as a righteous person, and on that account stands in safety before the tribunal of God, where all sinners are confounded and ruined." Again: "We simply explain justification to be an acceptance by which God receives us into his favor, and esteems us as righteous persons." Justification is to Calvin "no other than an acquittal from guilt of him who was accused, as though his innocence had been proved." Calvin makes no effort to elucidate the term (Gen. xv, 6), where it is said "Abraham believed in the Lord," i.e., Abraham held fast to God, trusted in God, had *fiducia*, and this trust in God was counted to him for righteousness, i.e., he was accepted as being in the normal attitude to his Creator.[1] Again, Calvin

[1] See Gunkel to Gen. xv, 6: "Er glaubte Jahve auch dieses Mal, der aber erkannte daran seine Frömmigkeit."

quotes Luke xviii, 14, affirming, "when it is said, that the publican went down to his house justified, we cannot say that he obtained righteousness by any merit of works." This is correct, but, the context there also makes it evident to any unbiased reader, who is not trying to argue a point, but endeavoring to comprehend the thought, that Christ desired to praise the humility of the publican, who keenly felt his shortcomings, who had compunction and was inwardly in the right attitude towards God; and that, therefore, the publican went home accepted by God rather than the Pharisee. Calvin sees one side of the truth, Osiander the other: the rightness or righteousness is imputed, but is also inherent, as Abraham was blessed and imputed righteous because he trusted God, because "he obeyed God's voice" (Gen. xxii, 18); and the publican was accepted by God or imputed righteous, because he was humble and confessed his shortcomings. The eternal goodness of God is prophetic and creative; where God sees humility and repentance or confiding trustfulness, he accepts this attitude of mind and through his creative Spirit gradually pours into the aspiring soul more and more of his divine life, accepting the man as righteous and making him rightminded, good, just. See Rom. vi, 18: "You have passed into the service of righteousness," i.e., the sinner receives actual righteousness.

It is true, as stated above, that the publican did not obtain righteousness "by any merit of works," nevertheless he had a deep sense of his sinfulness, as later on a Luther had it, who rightly held that such a contrition "has a right to plenary remission of pain and guilt, even without letters of pardon." Ambrose beautifully styled confession of sin a legitimate justification. Calvin considered Osiander's views as "pestiferous, to be rejected by all judicious and pious readers," because, on account of his formal method of procedure, he could not readily see the other side and recognize the kernel of truth in his opponent's viewpoint.

Calvin conceded that all goodness, whether in a pagan or in the "elect," comes from God, as there is none good but One; but he would not concede, that whoever is laudable, or virtuous or good upon earth "shares the goodness of the One." Horne[1] well says: "To recognize in any man a good character is to recognize something of the divine in him and any man who finds it in his heart to will the good can say truly, thus far, 'I and my Father are one.' To will the good is to identify man's will with God's will." From this statement Horne does not conclude that man's goodness is his own. On the contrary, he with Calvin ascribes all goodness in man to God, but he affirms that whatever is good in man, whether he be a pagan or an "elect," is divine goodness in man.

II Calvin's Complexio Oppositorum

The second peculiarity of Calvin is the *complexio oppositorum* of his system; in other words Calvin's *Institutes* are not a unity, they contain profound contradictions. Augustine was in the same predicament. The same stricture frequently holds true of statements found in the Westminster Confession of Faith and other creeds of the Protestant Church. The Westminster Shorter Catechism for instance holds that baptism is a sacrament that signifies and seals our engagement to be the Lord's and is not to be administered until the candidates "profess their faith in Christ and obedience to him," yet in the next sentence it teaches "that infants are to be baptized." In defining the sacrament we find the same *complexio oppositorum* in the Shorter Catechism. In Question 92 Christ and the benefits of the new covenant are applied to believers by sensible signs, whilst in Question 96, the worthy receiver is made partaker of the benefits of the sacrament by faith.

The Calvinistic conception of the Bible suffers from the

[1] *Psychological Principles of Education*, New York, 1922, p. 338.

same *complexio oppositorum*. Calvin asserts (*Inst.* I, vii, 1): "The full authority which the Scriptures ought to possess with the faithful is not recognized, unless they are believed to have come from heaven, as directly as if God had been heard giving utterance to them." And again (IV, viii, 9) he maintains, that the writers of the Scriptures were "sure and authentic amanuenses of the Holy Spirit." Over against this outward authority stands the inward authority of the Scriptures as expressed by Calvin's statement (I, vii, 5): "Those who are inwardly taught by the Holy Spirit acquiesce implicitly in Scripture." On the one hand, it is affirmed similarly in the Westminster Confession of Faith that the Bible is to be received as a revelation of God on internal grounds: "The authority of the Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or church, but wholly upon God; . . . our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth, and divine authority thereof, is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit." Over against this stands the assertion, that it "has been kept pure in all ages,"[1] and is "infallible," which makes the authority outward and formal, and is not in harmony with the historic facts in the case. William P. Merrill, as stated above, called attention to the fact that the creed of the Presbyterians is a "comprehensive creed," made up of varying, even conflicting views, which makes it an inclusive and not an exclusive document; on the one hand external and legal, on the other hand spiritual and vital in its character. This is true of Calvin's *Institutes*. His system is comprehensive; he endeavors to find a unity; to that end he neutralizes to some extent Biblical thoughts, connects even contradictory doctrines and thus brings together the total doctrinal material into a dialectically systematized whole. Adolf Harnack somewhere pointed out that the Roman Church is a "*complexio oppositorum*."As a char-

[1] *Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church*, Chap. I, iv, v, and viii.

acterization the term fits Calvin's system. Calvin does not look for a central doctrine or a material basic principle, from which to deduce all the separate theological doctrines, but he combines all existing individual doctrines into a systematic whole, including doctrines that are logically incongruous. See especially Calvin's doctrine of sin (Book II, chap. i, sections 1–6): "Adam ruined his posterity by his defection, which has perverted the whole order of nature in heaven and earth. The impurity of the parents is transmitted to the children, that all, without a single exception, are polluted as soon as they exist." The denial of this is an instance of "consummate impudence" to Calvin. When the Pelagians assert "that it is improbable that children should derive corruption from pious parents," Calvin refutes the Pelagians by asserting that such children of pious parents "descend from their carnal, not from their spiritual generation," this time, in the heat of the argument, forgetting the statement of his great forerunner St. Paul (I. Cor. vii) that children are holy if but one of the parents is a believer, again that "through one act of righteousness the free gift came unto all men to justification of life" (Rom. v, 18).

On the other hand, man cannot be as bad as Calvin painted him, for he himself maintains, that man is "inflamed with fresh ardor to seek after God, to recover those excellencies of which he is utterly destitute; that man is endued with reason and intelligence, that it is not the will of God, that man should forget the primitive dignity, which should justly awaken us to the pursuit of righteousness and goodness; we can aspire after the Kingdom of God. Man can inspect and examine himself by the rule of the divine judgment." To aspire means "to endeavor, to ascend," and implies inherent nobility, an earnest longing for that which is good. Not to make man wholly defiled, Calvin, inconsistent with his own statements of total depravity, borrows from Augustine the thought, that whilst man's natural

talents are by sin only corrupted, he has been wholly deprived of the supernatural ones.

Calvin ever and again affirms that we retain some degree of understanding and judgment together with the will, that we "aspire after the dignity which we have lost," and admonishes Christians: "Whenever we meet with heathen writers let us learn from that light of truth which is admirably displayed in their works, that the human mind, fallen as it is, and corrupted in its integrity, is yet invested and adorned by God with excellent talents." Again he writes: "If we believe that the Spirit of God is the only fountain of truth, we shall neither reject nor despise the truth itself, wherever it shall appear, unless we wish to insult the Spirit of God, for the gifts of the Spirit cannot be undervalued without offering contempt and reproach to the Spirit himself." . . . "We shall admire the writings of the ancients, because we are constrained to acknowledge them to be truly excellent. And shall we esteem anything laudable or excellent, which we do not recognize as proceeding from God? Let us then be ashamed of such great ingratitude, which was not to be charged on the heathen poets, who confessed that philosophy, and legislation, and useful arts were the inventions of their gods. Therefore, since it appears that those whom the Scriptures style "natural men" have discovered such acuteness and perspicacity in the investigation of sublunary things, let us learn from such examples, how many good qualities the Lord has left to the nature of man, since it has been despoiled of what is truly good," (Book II, chap. ii, 15). Here we have the peculiar solution of Calvin's *complexio oppositorum* as regards that which is "good." Gifts may be laudable, truly excellent, but if they are only natural, they are "not truly good," for over against the natural gifts stand, according to Calvin, "the gratuitous or supernatural gifts, which were taken away from man after the fall." These natural gifts can not be defiled in themselves,

as proceeding from God, but because they have ceased to be pure to polluted man, he can obtain no praise from them" (Book II, chap. ii, 16).

Rather would we say with Mrs. Browning:

> Earth's crammed with heaven,
> And every common bush afire with God,
> But only he who sees takes off his shoes.

Or with another author: "The Divine is everywhere about us, if we but knew it. The old difficulties between the natural and supernatural are banished by reading God into all parts of the world." "All nature is instinct with the divine, and nature and the supernatural are not two realms, but one. Everything that occurs is a miracle, for God is in it."[1] Calvin concedes "That in all ages there have been some persons, who, from the mere dictates of nature, have devoted their whole life to the pursuit of virtue," and concludes that God (in cases not belonging to the "elect") by his providence restrains the perverseness of human nature from breaking out in external acts, but does not purify it within. Again he grants, that the virtues displayed in Camillus, the second founder of Rome, were gifts of God, and if considered in themselves, appear justly worthy of commendation,—but they are not proofs of any natural goodness in him. These virtues are "not the common properties of nature, but the peculiar graces of God, which he dispenses in great variety and in a certain degree to men that are otherwise profane." Calvin overcomes his contradiction of calling a man's action laudable, most excellent, but nevertheless not good, if he is a pagan or a non-elect, by the following logic: If a natural man has integrity, his virtue is not *his* virtue but the peculiar grace of God. He argues as follows: "Whatever may be apparently laudable in ungodly men, ought not to be esteemed at all meritorious. . . .

[1] McGiffert, *Modern Relig. Ideas.*

The virtues, which deceive us by their vain and specious appearance, will be applauded in civil courts, and in the common estimation of mankind: but before the celestial tribunal they will possess no value to merit the reward of righteousness." The formal harmonizing tendency is ever present in Calvin's writings. He evidently considers religion, "as something apart from the ordinary and usual life and interests of man, or as something dealing with a distinct element in his nature, or as something foreign, that has to be grafted into his unreligious nature."[1] The Editor of *The Personalist*, April, 1924, in an article on "Nature and Human Nature," aptly says:

When the theologian has spoken disparagingly of the "natural" man he has meant man at his lowest, man unwilling to make the effort demanded for completest self-realization, but the term used, while representing a fact, has been misleading and unfortunate. This is especially true since those who so use this term suppose the whole world of nature to be the work of a supernatural divinity. In which case they have often put themselves in the predicament of commending God and condemning his works. If this world of temporal and spatial relations, of organic and inorganic life, is but that system of relations and realities which is upheld by the Supreme Creative Intelligence, it appears that the chief distinction between natural and supernatural is a distinction of character and possibility only, and not of nature. There remains then no reason why the old antipathy should still confuse us. Human nature most fully realizes its nature the nearer it approaches the divine. It may be that the destructive character of sin lies chiefly in its transgression of true nature, its unnaturalness.

Calvin's specious method of argumentation is again in evidence in Book I, chap. xi, 3:

Sometimes indeed God hath discovered his presence by certain signs, so that he was said to be seen "face to face"; but all

[1] Horne, *Psychological Principles of Education*, p. 333.

the signs which he ever adopted, were well calculated for the instruction of men, and afforded clear intimations of his incomprehensible essence. For "the cloud, and the smoke, and the flame," though in themselves symbols of celestial glory, nevertheless operated as a restraint on the minds of all, to prevent their attempting to penetrate any further. Wherefore even Moses . . . obtained not by his prayers a sight of the face of God, but received this answer: "Thou canst not see my face; for there shall no man see my face and live." The Holy Spirit once appeared in the form of a dove; but, as he presently disappeared again, who does not perceive that by this momentary symbol the faithful are taught that they should believe the Spirit to be invisible? that, being content with his power and grace, they might make no external representation of him. The appearances of God in the human form were preludes to his future manifestation in Christ. Therefore the Jews were not permitted to make this a pretext for erecting a symbol of Deity in the figure of a man. "The mercy seat" also, from which, under the law, God displayed the presence of his power, was so constructed as to suggest that the best contemplation of the Divine Being is when the mind is transported beyond itself with admiration. For "the cherubim" covered it with their extended wings; the veil was spread before it, and the place itself was sufficiently concealed by its secluded situation. It is manifestly unreasonable, therefore, to endeavor to defend images of God and of the saints, by the example of those cherubim. For, pray, what was signified by those little images but that images are not calculated to represent the divine mysteries? since they were formed in such a manner as, by veiling the mercy seat with their wings, to prevent not only the eyes, but all the human senses, from prying into God, and so to restrain all temerity.

III. Calvin's Biblicism

It was intimated above that Calvin is a Biblicist. The subject matter of Calvin's theology certainly is taken out of the Bible. Unquestionably, Calvin's doctrine of predestination, for instance, is found in the Scriptures. He

bases his presentation of it on Luther's treatise *De servo arbitrio;* he uses almost the same words as Luther, but using the religious convictions of Luther, he treats the subject of predestination in a clearer, a dialectical manner. Calvin's doctrine of predestination is not the result of purely philosophical speculation, but the result of the recasting of religious statements of the Bible into a dialectic-rational form. And this fact leads us to call attention again to the assertion, that we must clearly distinguish between material and formal Biblicism. Material Biblicism actually restates the subject matter of the Bible, *i.e.*, reproduces the thoughts of every writer of Holy Writ, without any endeavor to harmonize the various portions of the Bible. Such a procedure gives us Biblical theology, a theology of Isaiah, Jeremiah, of St. Paul, or St. John. Calvin recognizes this now and then, for in Bk. I, xi, 3, he rightly asserts: "The cherubim are acknowledged by all persons of sound judgment to have been peculiar to the old state of tutelage under the legal dispensation. To adduce them, therefore, as examples for the imitation of the present age, is quite absurd; that puerile period, as I may call it, for which such rudiments were appointed, is now past."

Here we clearly see why Calvin speaks of a puerile period in the Bible; it is because he is attacking the papists, "who idly pretend that there was some visible figure of God." Again, Calvin concedes that the Scriptures frequently ascribe to God "a mouth, ears, eyes, hands, and feet."

He writes (Bk. I, xiii, 1): "The Anthropomorphites also who imagined God to be corporeal, because the Scripture frequently ascribed to him a mouth, ears, eyes, hands, and feet, are easily refuted. For who, even of the meanest capacity, understands not, that God lisps, as it were, with us, just as nurses are accustomed to speak to infants? Wherefore, such forms of expression do not clearly explain the nature of God, but accommodate the knowledge of him

to our narrow capacity; to accomplish which, the Scriptures must necessarily descend far below the height of his majesty."

The only difficulty is this, that Calvin considers men's imperfect lisping of God as God's lisping with us and this viewpoint gives him the opportunity to explain away the different stages of the true knowledge of God in the various centuries of Bible history. That Calvin's Biblicism is formal is conceded by such historians as Williston Walker, Friedrich Loofs, and others. The Bible is to Calvin a legal authority; it has, as a whole, normative character; he desires to draw forth from the Bible all its content.

One of the most characteristic expressions of Calvin on this subject is found in the *Institutes*, Bk. I, vi, 2, to wit:

> But, whether God revealed himself to the patriarchs by oracles and visions, or suggested, by means of the ministry of men, what should be handed down by tradition to their posterity, it is beyond a doubt that their minds were impressed with a firm assurance of the doctrine, so that they were persuaded and convinced that the information they had received came from God. For God always secured to his word an undoubted credit, superior to all human opinion. At length, that the truth might remain in the world in a continual course of instruction to all ages, he determined that the same oracles which he had deposited with the patriarchs should be committed to public records. With this design the Law was promulgated, to which the Prophets were afterwards annexed, as its interpreters.—For, though the uses of the law were many, as will be better seen in the proper place; and particularly the intention of Moses, and of all the prophets, was to teach the mode of reconciliation between God and Man, (whence also Paul calls Christ "the end of the law,") —yet I repeat again, that, beside the peculiar doctrine of faith and repentance, which proposes Christ as the Mediator, the Scriptures distinguish the only true God by certain characters and titles, as the Creator and Governor of the world, that he may not be confounded with the multitude of false gods. There-

fore, though every man should seriously apply himself to a consideration of the works of God, being placed in this very splendid theatre to be a spectator of them, yet he ought principally to attend to the word, that he may attain superior advantages. And, therefore, it is not surprising, that they who are born in darkness grow more hardened in their stupidity; since very few attend to the word of God with teachable dispositions, to restrain themselves within the limits which it prescribes, but rather exult in their own vanity. This, then, must be considered as a fixed principle, that, in order to enjoy the light of true religion, we ought to begin with the doctrine of heaven; and that no man can have the least knowledge of true and sound doctrine, without having been a disciple of the Scriptures. Hence originates all true wisdom, when we embrace with reverence the testimony which God hath been pleased therein to deliver concerning himself.

That Calvin's formal Biblicism made it impossible for him to reproduce all the material of the Bible in every instance is self-evident; the difficulty lies in part in the subject matter of the Bible, which is a record of the ever unfolding religious life of the people of God in the Old and New Covenant. *Instar omnium!* No systematizing theologian can bring into harmony the spirit of intolerant particularism expressed by the author of the book of Esther, who conquered evil by force, with the spirit of our beloved Master in the Sermon on the Mount, who appeals to us to put on "the whole armor of God" by learning to overcome evil with good. Let me illustrate Calvin's lack of true Biblicism. Having affirmed (Bk. I, vii, 5) that we have received the divine original of the Scriptures from God's own mouth, and having the firmest conviction that we hold an invincible truth, he proceeds to reproduce the whole Bible doctrine. But his doctrine of God that seeks satisfaction is not at all in full harmony with Ps. 51, 14: "Deliver me from bloodguiltiness, O God, thou God of my salvation, and

my tongue shall sing aloud thy righteousness"; nor with I John i, 9: "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and righteous, to forgive us our sins;" nor even with Rom. iii, 21–26: "But now apart from the law a righteousness of God hath been manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ unto all them that believe; for there is no distinction; for all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God: being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, in his blood, to show his righteousness because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime in the forbearance of God; for the showing, I say, of his righteousness at this present season; that he might himself be just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus." See also John xvii, 25 and 26; Hebr. vi, 10; all these passages teach that God is righteous, just, not when he condemns, but when he forgives, when he loves; and man is right and righteous, not when he is perfect, rather when he is humble, penitent, loving. "Justification" is the Scriptural term for virtue, and as the most familiar attribute ascribed to both God and man it denotes more than mere justness; it denotes virtuousness in general.

Calvin was a great theologian. It has been conceded by many prominent scholars, that Calvin received many elements of his new anti-Romish presentation of the Gospel from Luther. Nevertheless his *Institutes* are an independent work. His formative power is unique. The accent in his theology is not identical with that of Luther. He has for instance, developed the doctrine of the Church, of the State, with far greater ability and clearness than the German Reformer.

At "The Calvin Commemoration Meeting," 1909, at London, the Dutch Theologian, Herman Bavinck declared: "Calvin is not the Plato or Augustine, but the Aristotle and

Thomas Aquinas of the Reformation." This evaluation of Calvin we unreservedly endorse.

In summing up, we think we have shown Calvin to be a "comprehensive" theologian, whose "formative and systematizing talent" was of a high order. In endeavoring to bring the records of the religious life, portrayed in the writings of the Old and New Testament, into a rational unity he has used more the methods of a "consummate logician and dialectician," than those of an historical exegete. Calvin's method was that of a formal dialectic rationalist, who earnestly endeavors to combine incongruous elements, and even his Biblicism is therefore formal and frequently not in harmony with much subject matter found in Holy Writ. This formalistic tendency was due to a great extent to his earlier preparation for the legal profession and the spirit of his age.

Calvin's legal mind needed a document on which to base his deductions. Choisy in his *La Théocratie à Genève au temps de Calvin*, published at Geneva in 1897, well says:

> The Calvinistic theocracy established the rule of the Bible, the statute book of divine law. Religion is thus conceived ecclesiastically; not as a principle of life, but as a government, and man becomes the subject of an absolute sovereign whose will is expressed by ordinances. That these be observed there is need of a body to keep watch, as a police force regarding the Law.

His system implied that there is in the Scriptures a definitely ascertainable rule of faith and practice. But his authority depended on his interpretation of that rule. Even those who would accept his cardinal principle of Scripture authority would not necessarily agree with his legalistic interpretation. Calvin even asked the State to enforce by secular arms his interpretation of the Bible.[1]

[1] See Walker: *John Calvin*, p. 279.

Notwithstanding all this, we admire his love for God's Word and his genius in endeavoring to present to his age an evangelical, deeply religious system of theology, by showing forth some of the outstanding errors of the ancient and the medieval Church. He erred in overemphasizing logic and outward authority, "embalming religion in wordy phrases," as some one has said. He painted the background of humanity black in black, ignoring to some extent the redeeming fact, that there is implanted yet, even after the fall, something of the divine nature in every human soul, that "we live and move and have our being in God," notwithstanding our sinfulness. He had little of the fine practical sense of George Fox, the Quaker, who asserted that "The seed of God reigns and is over all," and "that God is still revealing himself to mankind."

The Acceptance of Christianity by the Roman Emperors

By
Shirley Jackson Case

THE ACCEPTANCE OF CHRISTIANITY BY THE ROMAN EMPERORS

By Shirley Jackson Case, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of the History of Early Christianity, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

(*The Presidential Address, read December 28, 1925*)

FOR the church historian, there is perhaps no more baffling problem than to account for the union that was effected between Christianity and the Roman State. The acceptance of this new religion by a government bound up with the heritages and customs of a thousand years of heathenism would be an astounding phenomenon were it not already so familiar to the historian. Scarcely less perplexing is the corresponding transformation in the attitude of Christians toward the Roman government. It seems almost inconceivable that a religious movement, which began with the conviction that "all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them" were the proper possession of Satan, should ultimately hail with approval a union of Church and State. There is no need to rehearse the course of events that marked the gradual *rapprochement* of Christianity and the Roman State. That story has been well and frequently told. But the genetic forces operating in that ancient society to bring about this remarkable result, still await further analysis. It is in this particular field of research that our present study falls.

I

In modern democracies there is a prevailing tendency to separate sharply between Church and State. Religion and

politics are thought to have no common ground, no identical interests, and no legitimate intercourse with one another. But this dualism represents a psychological attitude for which antiquity offers no consistent parallel. The fundamental place of religion in politics was characteristic of all the different civilizations that flourished in antiquity around the Mediterranean basin. The rule of the Pharaohs in Egypt was so closely allied with the operations of religious rites that one sometimes finds difficulty in distinguishing between the royal and the priestly functions of the prince. The laws which he promulgated, the wars which he waged, and the ceremonies of his court were all fortified by ample religious sanctions. In the Tigris-Euphrates valley King Hammurabi issued his famous legal code as a revelation from the deity, and the conquering monarchs of the Assyrian empire fought at the behest of their war-god Ashur. The same reliance upon supernatural sources of protection and authority characterized the psychology of the smaller Asiatic nations. When the Moabites were successful in their war against the Hebrews, they ascribed the victory to the favor of their local god Chemosh. On the other hand, the Hebrews were confident that their god Yahweh had handed them their laws directly out of heaven, that he had anointed their kings in the past, and that he had promised ultimately to give them a royal leader who would triumph over all their enemies.

In the matter of supernatural assurances in politics, the Greeks and the Romans did not fall behind their Asiatic and Egyptian neighbors. The Greek city states always had their patron deities; heaven was believed to have displayed its keen interest in the establishment of centers of culture through granting immortality to their founders; oracles were consulted at crucial moments in political history, and individuals who were thought to threaten faith in the gods were treated as political enemies. The famous lawgivers,

Solon and Lycurgus, were reputed by tradition to have derived their wisdom from the Delphian Apollo. And when Greek political theory became imperialistic, in the time of Alexander the Great, not only were politics a care of the gods, but the prince and his successors themselves became deities.

The relation between religion and politics in the evolution of Roman society exhibited a similar trend. To be sure, the oldest form of Roman religion was not primarily political in its emphasis. We are able to trace back to a time when the dominant interest of the people was the home, the family, and agriculture. The crucial points at which supernatural power was needed to guard the most vital interests of society were the door at which an enemy might enter the household, the hearth where the women cooked the food, the store closet where the supplies were kept, and the boundary land of the farms under cultivation. If political interests had not yet invaded the area of religion, it was because the people had not given attention to political affairs.

When the ancestors of the Romans began to form themselves into a city state, which in time grew into an aggressive, imperialistic power, religion was called upon to produce a large number of new assurances to buttress the political superstructure. Since their own religious heritages were unequal to the new demands, the Romans imported from their Eastern neighbors such cults as were needed to support their political enterprises. Ultimately they were able to affirm with full assurance that the Roman people had been chosen by heaven to rule the world, that their kings had been of divine descent, that their laws had been derived from a supernatural source, that in oracles and omens superhuman wisdom was available for the guidance of the Senate and other officials of the State, that the commonwealth was presided over by gods whose worship the State

meticulously preserved, and ultimately that the rulers of the State were themselves sons of heaven.

The sophistication of twentieth century men, when applied in the sphere of modern politics, makes it very difficult for them to believe that religion ever could have been generally regarded as the cornerstone of political institutions. But it should be remembered that in a pre-scientific age, every phase of man's thinking moved much more readily in the area of the supernatural. While an Epicurean might vehemently assert that the gods did not meddle in human affairs, the masses of humanity were of a different opinion, and were very sincere in linking their political philosophy with belief in the reality of supernatural power. And, culturally, rulers were usually men of the masses. When they dedicated temples either to old gods or to new, when they sought initiation into the mysteries, and even when they accepted the popular acclaims of their divine descent, we have no warrant for assuming that they commonly regarded the procedure as a mere formality devoid of ultimate significance, except as it produced a desirable impression upon their subjects. That there were a few who looked upon it as sham, and who at heart were sceptical about their own divinity, is of course a well known fact. But in the main they shared fully in the thinking of their own times and acted genuinely on the conviction that the government they represented was a creation and a care of the gods.

II

As the death agonies of the Roman Republic proved to be the birthpangs ushering in the new Empire, both the disasters connected with the passing of the old order and the happier state of affairs inaugurated by the new, were closely associated with the action of supernatural powers. Notwithstanding the fact that religion had figured significantly

in the establishment of the Republic, in the first century before Christ, observers interested in the welfare of the State were compelled to remark upon the decline which religion had suffered. Varro was alarmed lest the Roman deities should perish from very neglect on the part of the citizens (Augustine, *City of God*, vi, 2), and Cicero warned his contemporaries that to cast off piety towards the gods would bring chaos to society. Neglect of sacred ceremonies was the inevitable forerunner of disaster, while assiduous observance of established rites was a guarantee of success (Cicero, *Nature of the Gods*, i, 2f.; ii, 3). While Varro and Cicero took a pragmatic and naturalistic view of the value of religion, many others saw in the disasters of the times clear evidences of the working of supernatural agencies.

That the fall of the Republic was really according to the will of heaven was most clearly discerned after the event, and by those who were most closely connected with the new régime. It is customary to speak of a religious revival inaugurated by Augustus. Certainly, he exhibited a very keen interest in religious affairs as related to the maintenance of the State, and the literature of this period glows with a satisfaction and confidence born of an assurance that the new political order is a superhuman creation. Ardent religionists of the Augustan age delighted to cite examples from the past showing how neglect of sacred rites had brought disaster upon the Roman people in years gone by. The violence of a Claudius, who threw the sacred chickens into the Tiber, when they refused to eat, had been attended by the destruction of his fleet, and the navy of his colleague Junius suffered a like fate because its leader had refused to heed the auspices. In contrast with these examples of perfidy stood those other leaders of Rome who, in the periods of her political success, had given scrupulous attention to religion.

An eclipse of the sun at about the time of the assassina-

tion of Julius Cæsar, and the appearance of a comet shortly afterwards, seemed clearly to indicate the interest of heaven in political events. Virgil clothed popular belief in the language of poetry, when he wrote that the very sun itself showed compassion for Rome on the day that Cæsar bled by veiling its shining face in darkness and thus causing a godless age to fear unending night. Then he went on to enumerate the portentous occurrences which had been witnessed in different parts of the Empire. Terrible voices had been heard in the depths of the silent groves. Terrifying apparitions had been seen in the early dawn. The beasts of the field had uttered human speech. Rivers had been suddenly swallowed up by terrifying cracks that had appeared in the earth. In the temples images of ivory and bronze had wept and perspired. Floods had swept away whole forests, had devastated cultivated fields, and carried away the cattle in their stalls. Wells of water had turned into blood, and wolves had appeared in the very heart of the city. Sudden electric storms had been very frequent and of great severity, and a fearful comet had appeared. These terrifying manifestations were prophetic of that climax of agony to be experienced in the terrible civil strife which brought the Republic to an end. Heaven had forecast the fact that "Thessaly and the broad plains of Hæmus should twice be glutted with Roman blood" (Virgil, *Georgic* i, 492).

The language of Pliny the Elder, as one would expect from this Epicurean naturalist, is more sober but hardly less significant. He reports that the comet, which had showed itself for seven days during the period when Augustus was celebrating games in honor of Venus, was taken by the common people to indicate that the soul of the murdered Cæsar had been admitted to a place among the immortal gods. But Augustus saw in the phenomenon an indication of heaven's favor for the new régime. While in public he expressed himself in agreement with popular opinion, in secret

"he rejoiced at this auspicious omen, interpreting it as produced for himself." And even the sceptical Pliny adds "to confess the truth, it really proved a salutary omen for the whole world at large" (Pliny, *Natural History*, ii, 23). Very apparently the man in the street, the new emperor himself, and even the most noted scientist of the next century, each in his own way, coupled the political events attending the rise of the Empire with the operation of cosmic powers.

Above all others, Virgil was the prophet of the new day. In his oft-quoted Fourth Eclogue he boldly forecasts the early end of the times of agony and the dawning of a new day when the political order will embody more perfectly the kindly will of heaven. Men are to be liberated from their age-long fears, and only a few stains of the old-time sin will survive. Under the rule of a heaven-born king the earth will bring forth her fruits spontaneously, the warring elements in nature will be transformed into agencies of peace, the lion will no longer prey upon the ox, the serpent and the poisonous herbs will be exterminated, and foreign spice plants will grow spontaneously in every field. The ripening grain will no longer be smitten by blight, the grapes will hang in abundance on the bramble, and the sturdy oak will drip honey. Such are to be the divinely bestowed blessings accompanying the inauguration of the new age to be attained through the supernatural establishment of a new political order.

Virgil was more fortunate than most prophets in living to see the day when he could believe that to a considerable degree his predictions had attained fulfilment. With the institution of the new régime under Augustus, Roman history could be reread in a new light and the care of the gods for Roman politics could be discerned with new clearness and new assurances. Now the poet could say without hesitation that in the person of Augustus is to be seen the

fulfilment of a divine prophecy to the effect that Ilia shall bear to the loins of Mars twin children, and that no bounds shall be set to the fortunes of the Romans, nor any term of years, for theirs is to be a never ending empire (*Æneid*, i, 272 ff.).

When we recognize the genuine interest in the supernatural which characterized the psychology of Roman imperialism, it sheds light upon a number of concurrent circumstances. It is the presence of this attitude of mind in the Roman world that makes possible, and popular, that astonishing phenomenon known as emperor worship. It ought to be apparent even to the casual observer that the Romans did not philosophize their way into this cult, by first working out a logical definition of deity as applied to the person of the ruler. Nor was emperor worship in the first instance a superimposition of the imperial court or the Senate upon the Roman world. Rather, it was the outcome of that world's effort to express its appreciation of the new, stable order of things which had been introduced into the Mediterranean basin through the elevation to power of a prince capable of maintaining peace and prosperity. Of course, the phenomenon was not wholly new. The same type of religious psychology had long existed in the East, whence the incentive for the Roman practice derived a large measure of stimulus. But, granting a situation in which people customarily credit political well-being to divine favor, it is not difficult to realize how easy it would be for them to regard the vast and powerful Roman Empire as a genuinely superhuman creation, and to think of the emperor in whom the authority centered as himself divine. Various as may have been the factors that contributed to the rise of the imperial cult, the characteristic attitude of the Romans toward religion as the foundation of political welfare, alone makes the phenomenon explicable.

The attitude in question is further illustrated by the

method of the Roman government in dealing with foreign cults. The traditions regarding formal acceptance of such cults may often be of doubtful validity, but the interpretation put upon those traditions in the imperial age is fairly clear. Livy, for example, makes it perfectly evident that the admission of a foreign god into the sacred precincts of Rome is a very serious business and a matter of fundamental significance for the welfare of the State. While it is true that in general foreign religions are to be accepted with reserve and strange rites are to be kept strictly within bounds, there is a manifest feeling that the Roman government has been able in the past to secure no small measure of benefit through the official adoption of certain foreign religions. In this way a very real supernatural increment had been added to that body of divine guarantees with which the political career of Rome began.

Hostile procedure of the government against foreign religions and philosophies is similarly motivated. It is true that practical politicians of the old school, who raised their voices from time to time in protest against the influx of those foreign cults which became more and more numerous in the imperial age, often speak as though they felt that the danger lay only in the natural realm of social well-being. They fear a perversion of Roman morals, or instigation to rebellion hatched up in secret meetings, and like social dangers. Yet these men are not unaware of the fact that the safety of Roman society rests upon the perpetuation of established customs in dealing with the divine power. The words which Cassius Dio puts into the mouth of Mæcenas as an admonition to Augustus, an address which is really meant for the benefit of the youthful Alexander Severus of Dio's own day, are typical:

> Reverence the divine power yourself everywhere in every way, following our fathers' belief, and compel others to honor

it. Those who introduce strange ideas about it you should both hate and punish, not only for the sake of the gods (because if a man despise them, he will esteem naught else sacred) but because such persons by bringing in new divinities, persuade many to adopt foreign principles of law. As a result, conspiracies, factions and clubs arise which are far from desirable under a monarchy. Accordingly, do not grant any atheist or charlatan the right to be at large. The art of soothsaying is a necessary one, and you should by all means appoint some men to be diviners and augurs, to whom people can resort who desire to consult them on any matter, but there ought to be no workers of magic. Such men tell partly truths but mostly lies and frequently inspire many of their followers to rebel (lii., 36).

The State's attitude of reverence toward the supernatural is still further attested by its later adoption of oriental religions, particularly the worship of the invincible sun (*sol invictus*). For a long time many Romans must have felt the inability of their own religion to provide a deity whose original magnitude was sufficient to correspond with the vastness of the Empire. Even Virgil had set the example at the very beginning of imperial times, of appealing to the sun as the true divinity who watched over the affairs of state (*Georgic* i, 463 ff.). But it was not until the third century that the oriental cult of the sun came to be fully at home in Rome and to constitute the principal religious assurance of the Empire. The motive inspiring the State in its loyalty to this new-found deity is very manifestly its desperate quest for supernatural help during the period of continued distress and frequent chaos experienced in the history of the Empire after the death of Marcus Aurelius.

A glance at the religious features of the reforms of Diocletian helps one to realize still more certainly that the late Empire had lost none of its interest in religion as basal to a well ordered government. While there had been a considerable change in the formalities of religion, as compared

with the situation in the earlier days of the Empire, the same psychological attitude still prevailed. Politics and religion were viewed as one common area of interest, and affairs of state were thought to be safe only when there was close union between the government and the gods. While Diocletian took the title of *Jovius*, and Maximian that of *Herculius*, it was no longer the old Roman Jupiter and Hercules from whom the two Augusti thought to derive their right and power, but it was in reality the oriental *sol invictus* to whom they attached themselves in the hope of insuring restoration and permanence to the tottering Empire. It is further significant in this connection that two years after Diocletian's retirement, when he and his old colleague met for a conference at Carnuntum to devise plans for averting the growing menace of political disintegration, their first act was to restore in that city one of the temples of this oriental deity. By paying him this new attention they evidently thought they would secure a new increment of divine help for healing the ills of the distressed political order.

Perhaps it is unfair to generalize upon this hasty survey of examples illustrative of the religious psychology of Roman imperialism. But as everyone doubtless knows, the number of illustrations might have been almost indefinitely multiplied. The characteristic attitude of the Roman government toward religion throughout the whole of the imperial period was one of marked deference and very serious concern. Interest in the old religion of the Roman people rested upon a firm and persistent conviction that the inherited religious observances were an assurance of safety to the State. When new cults became popular, the State's attitude toward them was determined by the same criterion of value. If they were thought to work harm to the public welfare, either by diverting the citizens into unprofitable areas of thought or action, or by angering the deities through con-

sequent neglect, then the State was hostile toward the new cult. On the other hand, when the authorities saw a cult sufficiently powerful to attract wide attention, and when it seemed to offer new and larger guarantees of supernatural protection for the government, it was not only tolerated but by many of the princes very heartily espoused. Thus religion and politics, or, as we might say, Church and State, were never dissociated in imperial Rome, and in the thought of the people of that age religion constituted the ultimate ground of confidence in the stability and perpetuity of the political order.

III

In the light of the foregoing observations, the circumstances which brought about the Roman Empire's acceptance of Christianity, first as a tolerated religion and later as the only religion recognized by the State, become readily understandable. It must be remembered that we are not here speaking of the gradual process of historical evolution by which the Christian movement, originally an obscure oriental cult, attracted to its membership increasing numbers of adherents from Roman society at large. That would be a long story and involve the examination of a wide range of social phenomena in the Mediterranean world over a period of some three hundred years. The specific point that concerns us here is to explain the action of the Roman government itself in accepting Christianity as a favored religion of the State. Does this change represent some radical reversal of the religious psychology of the Empire? Is the policy of the government fundamentally altered by the acceptance of Christianity? Or has Christianity now come to share essentially the same sort of favor from the authorities that had always been a part of the imperial policy toward recognized areas of supernatural operation?

In the first place, the persecutions of Christianity by

the Roman government should give us some light on this problem. Such persecutions as occurred before the year 250 can scarcely be said to show any general aggressive policy of the government toward Christianity. To be sure, this new religion had fallen into disfavor in many parts of the Empire and certain officials had taken action against it, but for reasons that were in themselves mainly local. The central government had from time to time placed its approval upon the action of its representatives, but it had not itself, so far as we are aware, issued any formal declaration of policy applicable to the whole kingdom. The Christians had been roughly handled by the authorities at various points in the Empire, as occasion arose, on account of the offense which they gave either to the populace or to the local officials. The characteristic charge brought against them was in effect that they were enemies to society. They held secret meetings, they indulged in private religious rites, they refused to participate in the local, traditional religious activities. When put to the test, they would not acknowledge Cæsar as lord. They declared that the traditional gods were no gods, but were merely demons. Now in a state where religious guarantees were thought to furnish society its most genuine safeties, it is easy to perceive how Christians would incur the hostility of the authorities, and it is just here that we find the most satisfactory answer to the question, why Christianity was persecuted by the Roman government. The Roman officials never concerned themselves with specific items of Christian religious teaching, and they did not entertain any unusual measure of hostile feeling toward this new religion merely because it was a foreign cult. That was a phenomenon with which Roman society had become thoroughly familiar. But amid this mixture of religions, Christians soon became conspicuous on account of their so-called atheism, which it should be remembered is not a charge that they do not believe in any god, but rather

that they do not believe in the established gods. By this attitude, they were of course threatening the very foundations of political safety as interpreted by the characteristic psychology of the imperial age.

By the middle of the third century the Christian movement had become so conspicuous in society that the emperor Decius instituted persecution of Christians as a deliberate policy of the government. His first demand was that sacrifice should be made to the gods of the State, and to the genius of the emperor. The authorities were instructed to strike particularly at the leaders of Christianity, although the requirement to sacrifice was universally applicable, and disobedience was punishable by death. Decius' own death in 251 interrupted the imperial program, but only temporarily. Valerian introduced it with vigor again in the year 258, decreeing particularly that the clergy should be put to death. But Valerian's rule ceased two years later, and it was a quarter of a century before Rome had another emperor with enough vigor, or one sufficiently interested in reorganizing the government, to give religious affairs customary attention. But under Diocletian and his colleague Galerius, religion along with other phases of social reform received proportionate consideration. In the year 303 the most severe and thoroughgoing persecution that had ever been experienced by Christians was set in motion, and when Diocletian retired in 305, his colleague Galerius still continued the policy of bringing Christians into line with the demand that all persons should worship the national gods.

It is important to note that the primary purpose of hostile action against Christians was to correct their atheism. They were dangerous to the State just because they slighted the gods who were supposed to insure the safety of the State. It is perfectly apparent that the Roman government would not have molested Christianity, merely as a foreign religious movement within the Empire, had Chris-

tians been willing to reverence the gods of the State side by side with their own special deities. It was this exclusiveness which distinguished the Christians from the adherents of other cults who were unmolested by the authorities. It would be just to say that the imperial government had no quarrel with Christianity as such, but only with that dangerous attitude which Christians assumed in refusing to revere those supernatural sources of authority which were supposed to guarantee the safety of the State. And in those days, when the State was suffering from calamities of so many sorts,—the successful incursions of barbarians, the breaking down of economic prosperity, and other evidences of social disintegration,—it was thought by the best emperors to be a serious obligation on their part to restore the rites of religion as a corrective, and in the last analysis the only sure corrective, for the evils of the day.

By the year 300 Christianity had become too widely accepted in Roman society to make possible a successful persecution on the part of the government. This fact was soon perceived by the emperors, who drew therefrom a characteristically Roman inference. Throughout the imperial period new religious authorities had been introduced from time to time to supplement the older divinities, with the hope that these new gods would give to the State the strength needed to establish the social order in safety. When the government became convinced that any religion had sufficient adherents to constitute a respectable body of worshipers to petition its divinities on behalf of the State, its aid might consistently be sought, provided it supplemented and did not abrogate traditional Roman religion. Hence for the members of some new religion to worship their own gods, side by side with the gods of the State, might easily be regarded as a virtue, in that it would contribute to the common welfare that measure of supernatural help, though it might be never so small, represented by the particular

deity of the cult. But the persecutors very soon discovered that Christians, when required to worship the gods of the State, either obeyed only half-heartedly or else positively refused to yield, and being no longer permitted to continue their own form of worship, they might come to constitute a rather large non-worshipping section of the population. This fact alarmed the observant emperor Galerius, who evidently was a true exponent of characteristic religious psychology of the Roman type. He very soon deplored the fact that by the persecution of the Christians the number of channels through which divine power might be drawn down from heaven into the society of the Empire was actually being reduced.

This discovery was the signal for a complete reversal of policy in dealing with Christians. The emperor's state of mind is perfectly clear from the edict of the year 311:

Among our other measures which we are always making for the use and profit of the commonwealth, we have hitherto endeavored to bring all things into conformity with the ancient laws and public order of the Romans, and to bring it about also that the Christians who have abandoned the religion of their ancestors should return to sound reason, for in some ways such wilfulness has seized the Christians and such folly possessed them that they do not follow those constitutions of the ancients which peradventure their own ancestors first established, but entirely according to their own judgment and as it pleased them they were making such [religious] laws for themselves as they would observe and in different places were assembling various sorts of people. In short, when our command was issued, that they were to betake themselves to the institutions of the ancients, many of them were subdued by danger and many also were ruined. Yet when great numbers of them held to their determination and we saw that they neither gave worship and due reverence to the gods nor yet regarded the God of the Christians, we therefore, mindful of our most mild clemency and of the unbroken custom whereby we are accustomed to grant pardon to

all men, have thought that in this case also speediest indulgence ought to be granted to them, that the Christians might exist again and might establish their gatherings. Yet, so that they do nothing contrary to good order. Therefore, in accordance with this our indulgence, they ought to pray their God for our good estate, for that of the commonwealth and for their own, that the commonwealth may endure on every side unharmed and that they may be able to live securely in their own homes (Eusebius, *Church History*, viii. 17).

In this decree of toleration has the religious policy of the Roman Empire undergone any fundamental change? Or rather, have we not here simply an extension of a policy with which we are already thoroughly familiar? The controlling motive in the edict of Galerius is to secure an increment of supernatural assistance for the Empire through allowing the Christians to worship their own God unmolested. The emperor may think that this benefit will be relatively small, but nevertheless Christians constitute a sufficiently large element in society to cause him to regard their cult with respect. The charge of insincerity sometimes laid at the door of Galerius by Christian historians, or the assertion that he changed his attitude because he felt death to be near at hand, are explanations for which I find not the slightest justification. He is a perfectly good exponent to the very last of the traditional religious policy of Roman imperialism.

Constantine's attitude toward Christianity, when he and Licinius expressed their approval in what has commonly been called the first edict of toleration in 313, is almost identical with that of Galerius, and is just that of the characteristic Roman ruler, who is interested in religion because it supports the State through appeal to supernatural power. A few sentences from the document suffice to make this plain:

When I, Constantine Augustus, and I, Licinius Augustus, had happily met together at Milan and were having under consider-

ation all things which concern the advantage and security of the State, we thought that, among other things which seemed likely to profit men generally we ought in the very first place to set in order the conditions of the reverence paid to the divinity by giving to the Christians and all others full permission to follow whatever worship any man had chosen, whereby whatever divinity there is in heaven may be benevolent and propitious to us and to all placed under our authority. . . . These things we thought it well to signify in the fullest manner to your carefulness, that you might know that we have given free and absolute permission to the said Christians to practice their worship, and when you perceive that we have granted this to the said Christians, your devotion understands that to others also a similar full and free permission for their own worship and observance is granted for the quiet of our times, so that every man may have freedom in the practice of whatever worship he has chosen. And these things were done by us that nothing be taken away from any honor or form of worship (Lactantius, *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, 48).

In this document one perceives very easily the real basis of Constantine's favor for Christianity. First, there is the characteristic attitude of an emperor who is seeking supernatural support for his government, and secondly, there is a recognition of the fact that the Christian element in the population has now become so large, and its support of Constantine and Licinius in their conflict with rivals who still opposed Christianity, is so highly esteemed, that the emperors are ready to credit the Christian God with the exercise of a measure of supernatural power on a par with that of the other gods of the State. As time went on, Constantine and his successors became more and more fully satisfied that the supernatural sources of power available to the Christians were alone adequate to meet the political situation. Constantine's ultimate victory over all his rivals seemed to be a very substantial evidence of the correctness of this position,

and two generations later Theodosius was willing to risk all in the keeping of the Christian God.

If the foregoing interpretation of the historical process is correct, the acceptance of Christianity by the state authorities is after all not a strange phenomenon. It represents essentially a perpetuation of the characteristic religious psychology of all emperors. The adoption of Christianity by an emperor was not essentially different in principle from the conversion to *sol invictus*. The event was the outcome of a long process of social development. Gradually the Christian movement had won to itself larger and larger elements in society. Alarmed at its so-called atheism, some of the more vigorous rulers had attempted to whip its adherents into line and prevent their endangering the safety of the State by neglecting worship of the national gods. But, failing in this attempt, and discovering that Christians still survived and the State suffered no immediate calamity in consequence of this persistence, the emperor determined to use such help as Christians were able to give by their prayers for the State and their pledge of the favors which their God was able to bestow.

When the emperors made overtures they found the Christians ready to respond. Even as early as the second century, some Christian leaders had discovered that the real basis of imperial hostility was a fear that the Christians were dangerous to the State because their atheism was supposed to threaten its religious foundations. On learning of this, Christians rapidly changed from their original attitude of indifference toward politics, or of tacit hostility, and proceeded to affirm more and more clearly that they were ready to pray for emperors, and to assert that the adherents of this new religion constituted the most valuable element in imperial society because they themselves were in league with the God of gods, the supreme creator and master of the universe. Long before any emperor accepted their promises

of help, they had been proffering their services to the State through declarations of loyalty on the part of their apologists. On one point only were they unyielding. They refused to worship any deities except those of their own cult, their Lord Jesus Christ and the God whom they had taken over from their Hebrew predecessors. But they unblushingly declared themselves to be the most honest people in the State, the most ready to pay taxes, and the most zealous and effective in their prayers on behalf of the commonwealth. As late as the end of the second century, a Tertullian could still think it impossible that any Roman emperor should ever be a Christian, but in the fourth century large numbers of Christians had attained a psychology that could pronounce the marriage between the Christian religion and Roman politics to be a perfectly legitimate and divinely authenticated union. Presently it came to be a commonly accepted opinion that Christianity and the empire were co-extensive and co-eternal. A transcendentalized imperial system furnished Augustine his model for the true city of God on earth, and the Christian Jerome, on learning of the sack of the Eternal City by Alaric, was benumbed with grief and astonishment. Evidently the eternity of the Roman State had now become as essential a belief for the Christian theologian as it had formerly been for the old Roman politician.

This was really a much more radical change in the Christian attitude as compared with earlier views, than was the change which the emperors underwent when they admitted Christianity among the recognized religions of the State, or even when they made it the only legitimate religion. If a summary statement is to be made, we should have to say that Roman emperors in adopting the new religion departed less radically from the psychology of their predecessors than Christians did in becoming Roman imperialists.

Religious and Moral Conditions Among the Canadian Pioneers

By

John T. McNeill

RELIGIOUS AND MORAL CONDITIONS AMONG THE CANADIAN PIONEERS[1]

By John T. McNeill, Ph.D., Professor of Church History, Knox College, Toronto, Canada

(*Read December 30, 1923*)

THE generous phraseology of our title may suggest a field of inquiry larger than that covered by the following study. The data to be here considered are derived from the records of life in Protestant settlements formed after the close of the French régime (1763) and within the provinces east of Lake Huron. The accompanying bibliography will indicate the principal sources utilized, and the limitations of these will be noted by expert students. While admittedly incomplete, they have been sufficient to illustrate certain phases of pioneer religious and social life, and the writer feels justified in the hope that the main impressions here given will not be negatived by further investigation.

The effort is made to visualize a certain primitive stratum of New World social phenomena, which in different areas appears at different times. Conditions in Pictou County, Nova Scotia, in the last quarter of the eighteenth century, for example, were to some extent paralleled in Oxford County, Ontario, in the second quarter of the nineteenth. Thus while the study ranges over nearly a century, we are concerned with particular areas for short periods only.

[1] The words *Canada* and *Canadian* are for convenience used in the geographical sense which they assumed at Confederation.

I. Religious and Moral Heritage of the Pioneers

1. Of the considerable number of overseas races that within our period contributed to the Canadian population those of the British Isles supplied the vast majority. Such scant evidence as the early census returns present, points to the preponderance, among these groups, of the Irish. This is true of the earliest census reports which supply data on origins, both in Nova Scotia (1767) and in Upper Canada (1842). The Irish predominance in Nova Scotia dates from about 1763, and was apparently overcome by the arrival of many Scotch settlers during the late years of the century.[1]

Numerically strong also were the natives of the colonies which became the United States of America. During the middle eighties some forty thousand Loyalists migrated to Canadian territories. They settled whole townships or counties, and in one case inaugurated a province. Later a steady migration of trading and farming classes came in from the adjacent States. Racially the Loyalists were highly composite. A recent student of the early settlements, without estimating relative numbers, tabulates thirteen entries for the United Empire Loyalists, six of which specify Dutch or German extraction.[2]

Of other American settlers the majority were English Yankees, and many of them were employed in trade. That their sympathy with the States would prove a decisive factor in the war of 1812 was confidently expected by American visitors to Ontario, one of whom estimates the Upper

[1] D. Allison, "Notes on A General Return of the Several Townships" in *Collections of the N. S. Hist. Soc.*, Vol. vii, 1891, p. 45 f. See also the N. S. census for 1827, which shows 13,949 of the 37,647 Presbyterians in the Province resident in the Pictou District, while the Sydney District has 12,760. These areas were settled in this period almost entirely by Scotch immigrants.

[2] A. H. Hunter, "Ethnographical Elements of Ontario" in *Ont. Hist. Soc.*, Vol. iii, p. 180 f., especially p. 188. The number stated above does not include Mennonite groups not classed as Loyalists.

Canadian population as six-tenths American or the children of Americans.[1] Even Sir Isaac Brock estimated that seven out of eleven battalions would prove disloyal.[2]

In no province was any one racial element dominant. MacKenzie's variegated picture of the medley of races and religions at the Niagara election of 1824[3] is a fair representation of the whole population. If in some instances single townships were filled by a racially homogeneous group, this rarely extended to a county and never even approximately to a province.

2. A second consideration is of the social classes represented among the settlers. Since the vast majority of the population in the British Isles were in the eighteenth century socially unprivileged, it was in the nature of things that the so-called lower classes predominated among the settlers. It is not possible here to review the condition of these classes in the homelands.[4] In poverty and privation the new country had little to teach them: it offered them much in opportunity. Most of the settlers came on their own initiative, and these were doubtless among the more energetic and enterprising of their class. Often they had to overcome great impediments in order to leave their parishes.[5] But on the other hand numerous shiploads of immigrants to the provinces cannot be regarded as free agents. The less enterprising inhabitants of English parishes were

[1] Michael Smith, *Geographical View*, p. 117. *Cf.* John Mellish, *Travels*, Vol. ii, p. 338 (1812): "If 5,000 men were sent into the Province with a proclamation of independence the great mass of the people would join the American government."

[2] R. M. Cumberland, *Pioneer Problems*, p. 169. That disloyalty was not confined to the American-born Canadians can be seen from Canniff, *Settlement of Upper Canada*, p. 351; *cf.* p. 618.

[3] W. L. MacKenzie, *Sketches*, p. 87.

[4] See Traill, *Social England;* Lecky, *England in the Eighteenth Century;* Graham, *Social Life in Scotland in the Eighteenth Century;* Burton, *History of Scotland:* Rogers, *Social Life in Scotland.*

[5] Traill, *Social England*, Vol. v, p. 455.

often induced to go to the colonies more for the convenience of the parish authorities than for their own.[1] The Highland clearances sent away whole populations, faced by the alternative of migration or virtual enslavement.[2] In England and in Ireland there was many a "Deserted Village," the younger portion of whose former inhabitants had gone to America.[3] In such cases the selective process must have been to the advantage of Canada, but the emigrating part of the population differed little from the average of the impoverished peasantry.

It was unfortunate, too, for Canada that the more skilled and intelligent immigrants from the British Isles found their services in greater demand in the United States, and, in many cases, after a short residence in Canada crossed the border.[4]

The Canadian provinces also attracted a number of the privileged and cultured classes. Once in the country these comprised the government officials, members of the legislature, the clergy and other professional men, and a fringe of the official class consisting of half-pay officers who generally sought government appointments. A disproportionate number of this class were English. As a rule they were prompt to assert and eager to enhance their standing, and tenaciously struggled to monopolize privilege in every province. On the other hand, in course of time they inevitably shared the advantages of their aristocratic inheritance with those of humbler origin, and made a valuable contribution in gentility and culture.

[1] That these were "inferior both morally and physically" is the opinion of W. L. Grant; *History of Canada for Ontario High Schools*, p. 171.

[2] The famous instance of the Sutherlandshire clearances belongs to the period 1800–1820.

[3] Lecky, *England in the Eighteenth Century*, Vol. vii, p. 260, footnote 2, quoting a pamphlet of 1786, speaks of villages of four or five hundred that were reduced to forty; "the young and healthy have dispersed themselves, those who could pay their passage having transported themselves to America."

[4] A. Shortt, in *Canada and its Provinces*, Vol. iv, p. 578.

. 3. Religious motives were not present in the migrations to the Canadian provinces. This general statement admits of little qualification. There were instances in which sectaries came in the hope of increased freedom. Shubal and Daniel Dimock, who had been whipped in Connecticut for their New Light views on baptism, sought the freer air of Nova Scotia, where they became distinguished in the Baptist communion.[1] The statement has been made that the Mennonites who came after the Revolution did so because they feared they would be forced into military service in the United States, although they were exempted under British rule.[2] Highlanders of Pictou, after church activities began in their midst, wrote to their old home that now they had the Gospel in its purity, and on this inducement brought a number of their countrymen to join them.[3] But the mass of settlers at all stages came to obtain material and not religious opportunity. This fact has been emphasized by a writer on the settlements in New Brunswick, who tells us:

All the immigrants of this period (1760–1783) were Protestant, and hence unlike their new fellow-countrymen the Acadians, were not influenced in their practical affairs by any church organization. Like men of the same race today, a desire for material profit was their leading impulse, and their religion did not interfere appreciably therewith. They extended their settlements where profit and pleasure led them, and subsequently organized churches in their new homes. Hence religious conditions produced no traceable effects upon the distribution of their settlements.[4]

[1] Bill, *History of the Baptists*, p. 29.

[2] Scherk, *Pen Pictures*, p. 77.

[3] Patterson, *Memoir of Reverend James McGregor*, p. 137.

[4] W. Ganong, *Monograph on the Origin of Settlements*, etc., in *Trans. Roy. Soc. of Can.*, 2 Ser., Vol. x, Sect. ii, p. 148. This statement bears a needless innuendo. It was indeed "a desire for material profit" that led most of the

So far as Upper Canada is concerned the chief traceable part played by religion in settlement appears in the government's plan by which the settlers in the St. Lawrence counties were grouped and divided. Their policy was to settle groups adjacent who would not be likely to raise religious strife, and for this reason "persons of the same faith but not of the same nationality were placed side by side."[1] Thus French and Scotch Catholics, German and English Protestants became neighbors. We have no means of judging how frequently religious opportunity determined the location of the individual settler. In a country where religious freedom was general and religious organization scanty, the new-comer had little choice in this respect.

The vast majority of the settlers were neither zealots nor rebels in religion. They brought with them the religious beliefs and preferences, if not the passions, of their former environment: "*Coelum non animum muto cum trans mare curro.*" But can we in any degree classify them religiously? The data are inadequate to permit of statistical accuracy. Except for Nova Scotia we have no religious census early enough to represent the religious alignment of the original pioneers. For Upper Canada the earliest is 1842; for Lower Canada the number of *churches* is given for 1827; the same for New Brunswick for 1840, where all Protestants are classed together; for Prince Edward Island we have the religious census for 1841.[2] For Nova Scotia we have the more relevant information of the religious census for 1827.[3] From these sources it appears that of the Protestant denominations most largely represented in early Canadian life the numerical order was as follows:

---

settlers to migrate; but it is not therefore to be supposed that such a motive governed every action of their lives.

[1] Croil, *Dundas*, p. 149.

[2] *Censuses of Canada*, 1665–1881, pp. 95, 129, 132, 135.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 94.

Nova Scotia, 1827		*Upper Canada, 1842*	
Presbyterians	37,647	Church of England	107,791
Church of England	28,655	Presbyterians	97,095
Baptists	19,790	Methodists	82,923
Methodists	9,408	Baptists	16,411
Prince Edward Island, 1841		*Lower Canada, 1827*	
Presbyterians	15,087	(Churches)	
Church of England	5,707	Church of England	39
Methodists	3,421	Presbyterian	4
Baptists	1,064	Methodist	5

The numbers of Roman Catholics at the dates indicated were: Nova Scotia, 20,401; Upper Canada, 118,810; Prince Edward Island, 20,235. In Lower Canada (1827) there were 191 Roman Catholic churches, in New Brunswick (1840) 51 Roman Catholic and 219 Protestant churches. Inquiry will naturally be made for the Lutherans and Congregationalists. These appear in nearly equal numbers in the Upper Canada census referred to, 4,524 and 4,253 respectively, relatively small groups: their order is reversed in Nova Scotia where "Dissenters" number 4,417, and Lutherans 2,968.[1]

These statistics furnish a suggestion of the religious affiliation of the pioneers at the time of their migration, but without further information they may lead us to mistaken conclusions. For example, it is well known that the Nova Scotia Baptists were not largely an immigrant group, but mainly of native growth, due to the conversion of former Congregationalists, and some others, to Baptist principles, in the period following the revival of Henry Alline (d. 1784). It is equally certain that the activities of the Methodist preachers in Upper Canada had changed the allegiance of many former Anglicans.

[1] A considerable number of small sects is recorded: Nova Scotia in 1827 had 158 Quakers, and fewer Universalists, Sandemanians, "Antinomians," Unitarians, Swedenborgians, and Jews, in the order named. Upper Canada had no Sandemanians, but could boast a few Tunkers.

There are obvious relations between the racial and the religious statistics of the period. That which is chiefly to be observed is that the Irish immigrants were, at least till 1820, very largely Protestant. This is indicated, for instance, by the fact that when the Irish predominated in Nova Scotia, the population was Protestant in the ratio of five to one.[1] The Highland Scotch immigrants were either Presbyterian or Roman Catholic, those from the Lowlands predominantly Presbyterian.

It will be seen from the above tables that the most numerous Protestant groups were those of the Church of England, Presbyterians, and Methodists. No Church was numerically dominant in early Canada, and this statement applies, with the exception of Quebec, to each several province.

4. In respect to moral qualities and habits the Canadian settlers on their arrival were probably neither much above nor much below the types from which they sprang. Of these the Scottish Presbyterian type is perhaps the easiest to distinguish. It had its own distinct morality, based upon generations of Kirk discipline. With these people precept and penalty had rendered habitual a reverence for the Bible, the Sabbath, and the moral law. There were of course all degrees of variation from the type. An early observer states that the Scottish "emigrants do not belong to that class in which religion has the strongest hold."[2] The trenchant satires of Burns are not our only evidence that in the Scottish towns and hamlets of the later eighteenth century piety could be both flouted and simulated. Vice and violence were common enough and changes in society were bringing for many a relaxation of the tradi-

[1] The General Return of 1767 shows 11,228 Protestants to 2,146 Roman Catholics, and there were 1,265 Acadians who were doubtless nearly all Roman Catholic.

[2] McCulloch, "Memorial," in *First Report of the Glasgow Colonial Society*, 1826, p. 36.

tional morality.[1] But the fireside piety from which "Auld Scotia's grandeur springs" had not departed, and it made its contribution in the early life of Canada. The Scotch who came were not the most cultured of their race, not the class who had been exposed to the new intellectualism. Neither were they recruited from the beggar troups that Fletcher of Saltoun had proposed to enslave for their own good.[2] They were in general the portion of the people of Scotland best adapted for pioneer life, sturdy in their prejudices and their purposes, undemonstratively religious, and (with inevitable exceptions) free from debasing habits.

The Irish settlers, so numerous in the early days, brought a contribution of sterling worth. Those denominated Irish were largely Ulster Presbyterians who added to the Scottish traditions they inherited a peculiar militancy against Roman Catholicism. The qualities of industry and thrift were well developed in these people[3] and their tendency to assert their political rights is familiar to students of the American Revolution. They are the kind of people one sometimes disagrees with but never despises.

Of the English settlers in Canada it cannot be said that as a group they present the moral characteristics of a distinctive type. This does not imply that they had less than others to contribute to the new society. Better off and better educated individuals of them who settled amid people of narrower traditions often gave to their communities an invaluable touch of refinement. The very hedges which they planted about their fields, intended, no doubt, as a reminder of home scenes, lent an air of something not primarily utilitarian, and illustrated the values of a higher

[1] Graham, *Social Life in Scotland*, p. 145.

[2] A. Fletcher, *Political Works*, p. 91 f.; J. H. Burton, *Hist. of Scotland*, Vol. viii, p. 6.

[3] Governor Wilmot recognized the "hard-working north of Ireland stock" as a "useful and valuable element in Nova Scotia" (*Canada and Its Provinces*, Vol. xiii, p. 112).

civilization. On the other hand, England did not scruple to rid herself, at the expense of Canada, of an element which has been described as "the pauper, weak-minded and petty criminal" layer of society. This migration proceeded in disregard of the frequent protest of Canadian authorities. Filth, disease, and immorality on ship-board during the long voyage out, added to the mischief.[1] From Ireland too came many unfit, sent to relieve their own country of responsibility for their maintenance.[2]

Americans entering Canada had passed through a generation or more of conditions physically similar to those they were to enter in Canada. They had experienced a process of unsettlement from the British or Continental society from which they were sprung. Even the Loyalists showed evidence of this process; and other Americans were generally distrusted as adherents or apostles of a doctrine of republican equality, and were disposed to reject class distinctions.[3] Aggressiveness and vanity are usually attributed, in special degree, to Americans by English writers.[4] But a number of the more careful observers of early conditions concur in the opinion that the more objectionable "Yankees" were mere impostors, new-comers from the old land who affected New England speech. "We had heard" says Mrs. Traill, "so much of the odious conduct of the Yankees in this country that I was rather agreeably surprised by the few specimens of native Americans that I have seen. They were for the most part polite and well behaved people. . . . They speak better English than

[1] A. Shortt, in *Canada and Its Provinces*, Vol. iv, pp. 567–577.

[2] *Ibid.*, Vol. v, p. 205.

[3] Ogden, *A Tour, etc.* (1799), p. 55; Letter of Gore to Craig (1807) in *Ont. Ed. Assn. Annual Report*, 1839, p. 296; R. W. Cumberland, *Pioneer Problems*, p. 166.

[4] See frequent expressions of this viewpoint in Fidler, *op. cit.* Fidler is perturbed because punishment by the rod is not practiced in American colleges (p. 310).

you will hear from persons of their class in any part of England, Ireland and Scotland." English travellers, she informs us, mistake earlier comers from England for Yankees "because they use Yankee words in their speech."[1] "I do not know," writes another British pioneer, "anything more degrading than the affectation of Yankee airs and idioms by the newly imported English settler. . . . The Anglo-Canadian copies the worst and most prominent features of American character, and the British settler in turn caricatures the copy."[2]

At a time when feeling ran high between the British and the Americans, it is not surprising to find a good deal of exaggerated criticism of the American immigrants on the part of British writers. Loyalists, too, with a memory of their grievances, were not appreciative of the later comers from the States. That Americans shared the same prejudices is shown by such statements as the following written by an American in 1813: "It is an idea entertained by the generality of people in the United States that the inhabitants of Canada are some of the worst people in the world, made up of rogues, murderers and the like mean characters. However the idea is entirely false. That there have been some bad characters escaped from different parts of the United States to Canada no one will deny; but they cannot be called the inhabitants but only sojourners."[3] Attempts to judge fairly were not common on either side. The critics of the Americans seem to have judged them by the "bad characters" who "escaped" into the country, of whom there were no doubt a considerable number.[4] "The old soldier or loyalist," says Canniff, "would sometimes unduly blacken the characters of the Fathers of the American Republic,

[1] *Backwoods of Canada*, p. 82 f. *Cf.* Howison, *Sketches*, p. 47.
[2] *Six Years in the Bush* (1832–1838), pp. 21, 22; see below p. 87.
[3] M. Smith, *Geographical View*, p. 59.
[4] See Strickland, *Twenty-seven Years*, p. 113.

for instance, the writer has several times heard it told as a fact that Washington was the illegitimate son of King George."[1]

The most general charge against the Americans, excluding that which is political, has to do with their business honesty. It appears that a large number of adventurers entered from the States, and one writer assures us that a volume would be required to present the stories of the women who have lost their property through these scoundrels.[2] Another attributed the decline in morality following the war of 1812 to the "wanton and unblushing profligacy of the American private soldier," which he believes has been communicated to the peasantry.[3] But other British Canadians make generous admission of the admirable qualities of the settlers from the south.[4] The advantage which they enjoyed over Old Countrymen lay in their experience of New World conditions and in the characteristic readiness and energy of their national type.

The recognition of women's rights in the home life of Americans frequently met with the disapproval of men of the Old Land. A traveller in the thirties quotes the remark of a practical young Scot, who was resolved, as he said, not to marry a Yankee lassie: "They'll blow the horn an' tak' a man frae the pleugh to fetch them a skeel o' water."[5]

II. The Influence of Pioneer Conditions on Morals and Religion

(a) *Liberation and Relaxation.*

1. The early pioneers, especially those who had put the ocean between them and their former homes, began life in

[1] *Settlement of Upper Canada*, p. 305.

[2] Fidler, *Observations on the Professions, etc.*, p. 272.

[3] Howison, *Sketches*, p. 83.

[4] Cumberland, *Pioneer Problems*, p. 165, citing Cartwright's *Correspondence*, 1799, in praise of the "intelligence and hardihood" of these settlers.

[5] Ferguson, *Practical Notes*, p. 132.

their new environment without those supporting forces of organized religion and settled and conventional morality to which they had been accustomed. In every part of the British Isles religion was a recognized and highly important phase of social life. The Established Churches professed to care for the religious interests of the whole population. Churches were the most prominent buildings, the clergy among the most prominent persons; and the burden of maintaining the religious system was distributed over all. But, in any Canadian Province, about 1800, the settler might chance to enter a community in which there was not yet even the rudest temple of worship, and he might live out his life without having opportunity so much as to join in a religious service. If he came from an environment of Scotch or Irish Presbyterianism, his every misdemeanor had hitherto drawn upon him the stern reproof of the kirk session; his small indulgences had been checked by those godly visitants who entered the public houses when "elders hours" had arrived; his profanity had been the subject of grave deliberation on the part of the fathers; his faith and knowledge had been fed by ample sermons, and tested in dread questionings on the catechism. Now, in the wilderness, religiously and morally he sank into a great void. If he came from England, or from the Irish episcopal fold, he missed the skyward-pointing church-tower, the sacred rites of the Church, the rhythm of the Christian year, the influence of the clergy in maintaining a tradition of culture and decency in society. If he had heard John Wesley or his itinerants preach, and had attended the Methodist Societies, with their moving oratory and their rigorous discipline, there was now to be a blank space of years before these experiences could be renewed. If he had been a tenant farmer, a laborer, or an apprentice, accustomed to a measure of obedience to another's will, he now suddenly became his own master, and entered on a task of lumbering

and new world agriculture, for which he had no special training. It would be surprising if in these circumstances we were to find no evidence of moral irregularity and religious retrogression.

2. Let us begin with an aspect of moral behavior in which the facts most readily come to light. The character of the pioneer was tested in nothing more severely than in the matter of indulgence in strong drink. There is here, at least before the late twenties, no question of total abstinence,—a solution of the problem that was scarcely yet seriously entertained in any quarter. It is the charge of the abnormal prevalence of drunkenness that we are to consider.

There is a vast amount of evidence pointing to an excessive consumption of alcoholic liquors. It is estimated in a nearly contemporary book that in the Maritime Provinces and Newfoundland before the American Revolution the consumption of rum alone reached 600,000 gallons per year.[1] A short time after its foundation Halifax had 100 licensed houses and, it is believed, as many illicit ones.[2] A military man long stationed in Halifax wrote in 1830: "The abuse of ardent spirits is an evil which extends its baneful influence through the whole country." He believed that it was "the cause of nine tenths of the military offences," and that it "checked the political and moral progress of the nation."[3] Haliburton ascribes the excess of the habit, which in 1829 he thinks already declining, to the cheapness of West India rum.[4] Laborers in Nova Scotia received rum as part of their wages and storekeepers

[1] Hollingworth, *Present State of Nova Scotia*, 2nd Ed., Edin. 1787, p. 169.

[2] MacMechan, in *Canada and Its Provinces*, Vol. xiii, p. 86. The prevalence of illicit liquor selling may have been due to the fact that licenses were relatively high in Halifax, viz., one guinea a month; Murdoch, *History of Nova Scotia*, Vol. ii, p. 252.

[3] Moorsom, *Letters from Nova Scotia*, pp. 35, 37.

[3] *Historical Statement*, Vol. ii, p. 294.

treated their customers to it in order to induce them to buy. But if it was employed with a view to stimulating business in Nova Scotia, in New Brunswick it is recognized to have had an injurious effect on trade.[1] A half pint per day for all males over sixteen was the average consumption of rum in that province in 1787.[2] The magistrates were allowed to grant licenses according to their judgment, at rates ranging from 10s. to £4.[3] In 1820, the 10,000 or fewer inhabitants of Queen's County, Prince Edward Island, could boast of 40 licensed houses, or one for every 250 persons.[4]

The people of Upper Canada gave a similar encouragement to the traffic. Even amid great hardships "many were woefully addicted to carousing."[5] A civil court, the first in Dundas County, showed in its earliest expense account (1790) charges for "liker for the gentlemen of the grant jury," and for "decanters broken."[6] Interest was lent to the elections of Oxford County by the barrels of whiskey at the polling booth. Both polling booth and barrels were kept open for four days.[7] Yonge Street, running northward from York, was generously lined with licensed shops, having fifty-eight in a distance of about half as many miles.[8] Grocery stores, bookstores, general stores, and other places of public business, were not complete without licenses, as the newspaper advertisements of the time abundantly show.[9] Even a religious newspaper, in the forties, carried advertisements of brandy, whiskey (by the barrel), and brewery properties.[10] "In almost every store there was a

[1] Hannay, *History of New Brunswick*, Vol. i, p. 446 f.

[2] Raymond, in *Canada and Its Provinces*, Vol. xiii, p. 170. [3] *Ibid.*

[4] Sutherland, *Manual of the Geography . . . of Prince Edward Island*, p. 40.

[5] Croil, *Dundas*, p. 137. [6] *Ibid.*, p. 145.

[7] Mackay, *Pioneer Life in Zorra*, p. 141.

[8] Scadding, *Toronto of Old*, p. 375 f.; Smith, *Pioneers of Old Ontario*, p. 295. Smith notes that railway development reduced the wayside liquor trade.

[9] See, *e.g.*, the files of the *Niagara Herald*, 1801.

[10] See the (Toronto) *Banner*, 1846, and *passim*.

whiskey pail and cup, and all comers were at liberty to help themselves."[1] The whiskey barrel was in many a farmer's home, and even where the original settler used it with moderation, not infrequently his sons were debauched by it.[2] Those whom liquor had impoverished were compelled to purchase it in smaller quantities. Many are the authenticated stories of tragedy and humor that survive to illustrate this phase of backwoods life. There was the old lady who tried to pawn her Bible for whiskey, and found that the storekeeper "would take neither her word nor the word o' God for a gill o' whiskey."[3] The child of an Irish settler said to Mrs. Traill: "Mother spends half the money father earns in whiskey to keep us warm," adding that he himself would prefer "good hot praters."[4] Town life was often characterized by immoderate feasts in which liquor flowed freely. It was observed that "Canadian bedrooms were not much used, because it was handier to sleep under the table."[5]

At an early stage in the history of Upper Canada the social institution known as the "bee" was introduced. It appeared first in the Bay of Quinte region, among military settlers accustomed to co-operation.[6] The word was applied to a gathering of settlers in order to do a piece of work difficult or impossible for one to accomplish alone, such as logging, erecting a log or frame building, stumping, butchering, and even various farm operations. At these affairs hard drinking was the rule, and the "grog-boss," or carrier

[1] Smith, *Pioneers of Old Ontario*, p. 292.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 297.

[3] The humors of the pioneer tippler's life furnish some fresh classics in Mackay's *Pioneer Life in Zorra.*

[4] Traill, *Backwoods of Canada*, p. 94. For a unique collection of the tragedies of pioneer drunkards the reader may see Hiltz, *Experiences of a Backwoods Preacher*, p. 228 f.

[5] Lizars, *In the Days of the Canada Company*, p. 300.

[6] Canniff, *Settlement of Upper Canada*, p. 185.

of the whiskey pail and cup, was "the most important person." Some settlers showed a tendency to rely on the inspiration of numbers and drink, and grew incapable of the lonely drudgery necessary to success on a farm. Life for them tended to become a "continual round of intoxication."[1] "Accidents were frequently the result of drink, and if the day was passed in safety, very often the revelry and drunkenness at night rendered the imbibers next morning in a sorry state for the work before them."[2]

That popular describer of pioneer life, Mrs. Moodie, has given straight from experience a very depressing picture of a logging-bee.[3] Her husband, who was himself, it appears, a model of good behavior, had been twice injured at bees through the drunken condition of others. He was the author of some vigorous doggerel descriptive of the affair at his own farm, in which the devil sits grinning upon a burning log-heap—

> And there was lots of swearing,
> Of boasting and daring,
> Of fighting and tearing,
> At that logging-bee.[4]

These conditions are abundantly attested for many communities. But on the other hand, there is also reliable evidence that, even before the days of temperance societies, bees were, occasionally at least, orderly and innocent.[5] And if the balance of evidence leads strongly to the conclusion that drunkenness prevailed at these gatherings, it must always be remembered that quiet industry is not so likely to be recorded as noisy and disorderly conduct.

[1] Strickland, *Twenty-seven Years in Canada West*, Vol. i, p. 36 f.
[2] Edwards, *Correspondence and Papers*, p. 25.
[3] *Roughing it in the Bush* (1871 ed.), p. 327 f.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 327.
[5] Shortt, *Life of a Settler in Western Canada before the War of 1812*, p. 10.

Much depended on the character of the community. When the influence of religion was absent, there was an added tendency to "wildness." The "Markham Gang" and the "Tenth Line Blazers" were nicknames for the hard-drinking and lawless manhood of irreligious settlements.[1] It is possible to overstate the degree in which the population was drunken. The people who laid low the forests of Canada were not habitually tipsy. An American witness about 1812 was struck by the fact that Canadians were comparatively well-behaved. "There is little horse-racing, card-playing, drunkenness and dissipation."[2] A Baptist missionary, after long service in the Ottawa Valley (Breadalbane, Argenteuil County, Quebec) declared that he had never seen a glass of liquor drunk in his place of labor.[3] Perhaps ministers were not the best informed observers of such matters. We know of another instance in which an ex-army officer concealed a keg of whiskey in his sleigh while a Baptist minister sat beside him on the seat.[4] An English clergyman having spent some years near Toronto says: "I never saw but one man intoxicated, and he was an Englishman returning to England." The only possible judgment of this statement is that its author possessed either very poor gifts of observation or a very high standard of intoxication. It may be of interest to observe in this connection that he and his good wife took brandy in their tea. He is at the same time well aware that "intemperance exists to a great extent," and believes, contrary to strict fact, that there are no temperance societies.[5]

The question naturally arises whether the Canadian

[1] W. L. Smith, *Pioneers of Old Ontario*, p. 142; Hilts, *Experiences of a Backwoods Preacher*, p. 123.

[2] M. Smith, *Geographical View of Upper Canada*, p. 64.

[3] *Sketch of the History of the Churches and Ministers of the Fiftieth Meeting, Ottawa Baptist Union*, p. 21, quoting Rev. Wm. Fraser.

[4] Thomas, *History of the Counties of Argenteuil and Prescott*, p. 355

[5] Fidler, *Observations on the Professions, etc.*, p. 269 and p. 387.

settlers used liquor more freely than was the custom in the countries from which they had come. This may seem doubtful, when we recall the extent of the drink evil in England and Scotland in the eighteenth century. A writer in the *Gentlemen's Magazine* said, "The Scottish people in their lives differ only from the brutes in their love of spirituous liquors."[1] In parts of Scotland roistering and drinking attended all social gatherings, christenings, funerals, weddings, "rockings," etc.[2] In England the revenue from the licensed gin shops that debauched numbers of the lower classes, was used to defray the expenses of foreign wars.[3] The enormous increase in drinking in England during the eighteenth century is well known.[4] Yet it seems probable that the Canadians exceeded their British relatives in their addiction to the vice. In the older countries, while drinking was favored, drunkenness was punished.[5] In many parts of Scotland temperate habits were cultivated by the co-operation and vigilance of Church and State.[6] In Canada these restraints were not, in the early days, much in evidence. Conviviality was comparatively free, and the temptation to excess was present on every hand. The extension of credit by business men induced many a farmer to drink up his property.[7] The lavish way in which liquor was distributed in business and politics, enabled young men

[1] Quoted by Graham, *Social Life in Scotland*, p. 178. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 186.

[3] Lord Chesterfield delivered a masterly oration against this abuse, in the House of Lords, Feb. 21, 1743, and 4 days later signed a strongly worded protest against the "Spirituous Liquors Bill" by which the House had just "authorized 50,000 houses to retail poison." *Journals of the House of Lords*, 26, 218–9.

[4] *Encycl. Brit.*, Eleventh Edition, Vol. xvi, p. 761.

[5] Various devices were used to expose offenders to public scorn. In Edinburgh they were forced by the police to stride a wooden horse. Graham, *Social Life*, p. 123.

[6] Graham, *op. cit.* p. 139, with reference to Glasgow where in 1764 Professor Reid saw no one drunk, except one *professor*.

[7] Howison, *Sketches of Upper Canada*, p. 97.

to form drinking habits without initial expenditure on their own part, and in most communities nothing short of unsocial detachment from his fellows would save one from intemperance. In these circumstances the only way open to combat the liquor evil was the formation of new social groups in which liquor was taboo. This was the function of temperance societies.

The sentiment against excess in the use of liquor developed into a sentiment in favor of total abstinence. Largely through the influence of the Churches (and the Methodist Church should be specially mentioned), temperance societies began to be organized. A society of three members, one of them a Presbyterian minister, pledged to abstain from spirituous liquors, was formed at West River, Pictou County, N. S., in October, 1827. Within a year the *Colonial Patriot* was able to announce the surprising news: "On Friday last the frame of a large dwelling house . . . was erected without the aid of *rum*." In 1830 a ship was launched at Pictou without liquor.[1] In the Canadas the earliest temperance society was probably that organized at Hallowell (Picton) in 1829.[2] An early so-called temperance society in Nova Scotia was an association of Halifax business men who agreed not to supply liquor to their employees.[3] In Adolphustown, Upper Canada, the members pledged themselves "not to furnish drink for raisings, bees, and harvest work," and for one year to abstain from private use.[4] In some townships these societies were strong enough to prevent the use of liquor at bees. There never was whiskey at a raising in Oro township,[5] where a temperance society came with the first settlers. In New

[1] Patterson, *History of the County of Pictou*, p. 386 f.

[2] Canniff, *Settlement of Upper Canada*, p. 311.

[3] MacMechan, in *Canada and Its Provinces*, Vol. xiii, p. 187. This writer ironically calls their action a "self denying ordinance."

[4] Canniff, *loc. cit.*

[5] Smith, *Pioneers of Old Ontario*, p. 301.

Brunswick the societies brought about a prohibitory law in 1855, which however soon proved a failure.[1]

The prominence of the Methodist leaders in the temperance movement in Upper Canada is an outstanding factor in its early history.[2] In the Maritime Provinces Baptists seem to have taken the lead.[3] Presbyterians were not unanimous on the question of total abstinence, but in some instances they lacked none of the zeal of the denominations just named. It is a remarkable fact that a Presbyterian congregation was founded in Hamilton in 1831, in which none were "received or retained as members who make, vend, or use as a drink, ardent spirits."[4] This is a more drastic regulation than that of the Methodist discipline of that day.[5] Thus the temperance movement in Canada was a later phase of things, entering at a time when the churches were securing a powerful influence, and mainly the product of that influence.

3. The moral influence of pioneer conditions upon the settlers may be traced, according to numerous observers, in the undue vanity, conceit, and insolence of behavior which they displayed. This tendency is described in scathing terms by English visitors of aristocratic mould, who were bitterly offended by the assertiveness and boastfulness of those whom they rated as members of the lower class. Talbot assures us that "Vanity is the grand characteristic of all natives of this Continent, whether white or Indian."[6]

[1] Hannay, *History of New Brunswick*, Vol. i, p. 447.

[2] Sanderson, *First Century of Methodism in Canada*, Vol. i, p. 232.

[3] Fitch, *Baptists of Canada*, Vol. i, p. 50.

[4] Gregg, *History of the Presbyterian Church in Canada*, p. 538, quoting the "Narrative of the Churches under the care of the Niagara Presbytery" (1834).

[5] "If any member of our Church retail, or give spirituous liquors, and anything disorderly be transacted under his roof on this account, the preacher who has the oversight of the circuit shall proceed against him, as in the case of other immoralities." *Doctrine and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada*, (1829), p. 84.

[6] *Five Years' Residence*, Vol. i, p. 110.

On the other hand Mrs. Moodie, who felt keenly the ill manners of some of her neighbors, states emphatically: "From this folly the native-born Canadian is exempt. It is practiced only by the low-born Yankee or by the Yankee-fied British peasantry and mechanics. It originates in the enormous reaction springing out of a sudden emancipation from a state of utter dependence into one of unrestrained liberty."[1] That this "unrestrained liberty" enjoyed by the settlers when sober rendered them the more unbearable when drunk, was the opinion of Howison, who had suffered many things in Canadian inns. "The influence of liquor only serves to draw forth their natural coarseness and rankness of feeling, and to make them, as it were, caricatures of themselves." He finds a "low tavern in Upper Canada" the best place in which to observe "the enormity which the human character assumes when unchecked by restraint, unrefined by education and unmodelled by dependence."[2] A pioneer missionary asserts that "The people have a great aversion to those who do not think them everything that is clever and excellent."[3] Haliburton, in his history, praises the "manliness of character which arises from conscious independence," which he finds in the Nova Scotia people and believes typical of the Anglo-Americans. But his *Sam Slick* has for the real object of its satire the overweening conceit of his fellow provincials, which makes them an easy prey to the "soft sawder" of cajoling pedlars.

4. The censors of the pioneers accuse them of a variety of other lapses from morality. Some contemporaries record an impression of widespread laxity in sex morals, and instability of marriage. The severest arraignment in this respect is that of Edward Allen Talbot. This writer with a good deal of circumstantial detail paints a condition in

[1] *Roughing it in the Bush*, p. 240.
[2] *Sketches of Upper Canada*, p. 225.
[3] Bell, *Hints to Emigrants*, p. 119

which the usual restraints are lacking, and wantonness prevails. He quotes Pope's

Every woman is at heart a rake

as specially applicable to the women of Upper Canada.[1] Women being in a minority are in great demand, especially young women with children, even if the latter are illegitimate, for the children will soon be an asset on the farm.[2] Amid other sordid cases of adultery he vouches for one in which "two well fatted hogs" were paid by a guilty neighbor in satisfaction to an injured husband.[3] He tells of a conversation with a group of representative dames of the Gore district, who mocked at obsolete "Old Country notions" of chastity. He informs us that "Scarcely a newspaper issues from the press, the columns of which are not graced by such advertisements" as these:

Whereas my wife Betsy Swiftfoot, *alias* the Widow Wild, has wantonly eloped from my bed and board without any just cause or provocation (having as I suppose become too wild to be steered by my compass) I do hereby caution the public not to give no credit to her on my account, as I am determined not to pay no bills of her contracting.

Cuckold's Hall,
Upper Canada, July 20, 1821. Jonathan Swiftfoot.[4]

The defamatory statements of Talbot were challenged in his own day in a book not available to the present writer.[5] The statements of many others are widely at variance with Mr. Talbot's. Even Howison, an earlier and equally biassed authority, beyond the most general hints lends no definite support to his judgments. A few years later Strickland, a

[1] Talbot, *Five Years' Residence*, Vol. ii, p. 38.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 40. [3] *Ibid.*, pp. 42, 43. [4] *Ibid.*, pp. 45, 47.
[5] R. Colton, *The Beauties of Talbotism.* This book was advertised in the *St. Thomas Liberal*, 1833. *Cf.* Ermatinger, *The Talbot Régime*, p. 269.

fair-minded witness, wrote: "In no country in the world does the torch of wedded love burn more brightly than in Canada, where the husband always finds the wife dearer than the bride."[1] A recent student, Ermatinger, disagrees with Talbot, and finds an "absence of crime and immorality."[2]

Instead of indicating further opposing opinions let us test that one of Talbot's statements which can be controlled by references to existing data, viz., the one about advertisements of faithless wives in the press. The writer has gone through the advertising columns of a few of the typical newspapers of the early days covering the 1790's, the 1800's, the '10's, the '20's and the '30's, including available numbers of the *Upper Canada Gazette and American Oracle*, the *Canada Constellation* (both of Niagara), the *Niagara Herald*, the *Kingston Gazette*, the *York Observer* (one number only), the *Quebec Gazette*. Most of these are available only in broken files, yet it is not unlikely that the search has covered nearly as many columns of advertising as Mr. Talbot saw during his five years in Canada. The notes obtained indicate just one dozen such advertisements as the one he has parodied; a number not very excessive. Two and a half years of the *Kingston Gazette*, in Kingston's bloated days of war profits, 1812–1814, yielded only five instances. The conclusion forced upon the investigator is that Talbot's statement is a malicious exaggeration.

Nevertheless, to see, even rarely, these notices thrust in among others about stray cattle and horses and sheriff's sales of land, gives an uncomfortable impression of a certain rawness and coarseness of life. In one instance the disowned but spirited runaway answers back in the next issue with a wordy and illiterate advertisement in which the ex-husband is accused of being a worthless rogue and a

[1] *Twenty-Seven Years*, Vol. i, p. 80.
[2] *The Talbot Régime*, p. 102.

horse thief.[1] The Niagara district of Ontario was the wild and woolly West!

Without being led into exaggeration, we may be sure that the pioneers were often unrefined in matters of courtship and marriage. "Occasionally," says a writer recalling the early days, "wedding guests were placed in an embarrassing position by the lateness or non-appearance of the groom, or maybe by the unwillingness of the bride at the last moment to consent to the ceremony, the confession being finally obtained from her that she had been married clandestinely to some secret lover."[2] Nor were irregularities confined to the humbler classes. Major Strickland credits the story which has attached itself to "Tiger" Dunlop, army surgeon, famous adventurer, and official of the Canada Company, that he tossed a coin with his brother to determine which of them should surrender his bachelorhood to their housekeeper.[3] Sir William Johnston, leader of the Loyalists, took to wife without ceremony the sister of Joseph Brant, the noble Mohawk chief; a proceeding which can hardly be justified on the ground of Indian custom.[4]

In the lower ranks of society, such irregularities were largely accounted for by the inconvenience of getting a minister or a magistrate to perform the ceremony. Canniff cites the instance of two servants, Peter and Polly, living in a respectable house, who were the parents of a boy some years old before they found opportunity, in a visit paid to the place by a justice of the peace, to have the knot tied.[5] The scarcity of qualified clergymen was the cause of many

[1] See the *Canada Constellation*, Dec. 7 and 14, 17, 99.

[2] Scherk, *Pen Pictures of Early Pioneer Life*, p. 224.

[3] According to Strickland the "Tiger" was not gambling; the coin had a head on both sides, though the brother did not know this! *Twenty-Seven Years*, Vol. ii, p. 5.

[4] Canniff, *Settlement of Upper Canada*, p. 81.

[5] The date is 1796. Canniff, *op. cit.*, p. 240

unblessed marriages. By the legislation of 1793 in Ontario the clergy of the Church of England, and (if one of the parties belonged to the minister's congregation) of the Church of Scotland and of the Lutheran and "Calvinist"[1] Churches were permitted to perform marriages; a magistrate could be employed if there was no qualified clergyman within eighteen miles of the bride's home.[2] The disabilities of ministers of other communions in this regard were removed in Upper Canada in 1831, in Nova Scotia in 1830, and in New Brunswick in 1834.[3] The Church of England and its few clergy were unpopular with many of the settlers, because of the alliance of Anglicanism and Tory privilege; and many couples either went over the border or sought a magistrate in preference to a clergyman. It appears that one reason for this was a dislike for the Church of England marriage service on account of its length and character.[4]

There seems good reason to believe that women of loose morals were not unknown, and not always treated as social outcasts. Take Mrs. Moodie's Betty, a character regarded by this authoress as typical. "She had had three husbands, and he whom she now had was not her husband, although the father of the splendid child whose beauty so wore upon my woman's heart. Her first husband was still living (a thing by no means uncommon among persons of her class in Canada), and though they had quarrelled and parted years ago he occasionally visited his wife to see her eldest daughter who was his child. She was now a fine

[1] Calvinist was made to include Baptist, on the basis of the "Five Points." Riddell, *Upper Canada Sketches*, p. 42.

[2] "An Act to Confirm and make valid certain Marriages heretofor contracted in the Country now comprised within the Province of Upper Canada." Section III (*Statutes of Upper Canada*, vol. i, p. 46).

[3] Hannay, *History of New Brunswick*, Vol. i, p. 443.

[4] Objection was taken not only to the tedious length but also to the "indelicacy" of the marriage service, especially the words: "With my body I thee worship." McGrath, *Authentic Letters*, pp. 197–198.

girl of sixteen, as beautiful as her little brother. Betty's second husband had been killed in one of our fields, by a tree falling upon him while ploughing under it. He was buried upon the spot, part of the blackened stump forming his monument. In truth, Betty's character was none of the best, and many of the respectable farmer's wives regarded her with a jealous eye."[1]

It would be tedious to rehearse the many references to the prevalence of dancing as a pioneer amusement, and perhaps impossible to compare former times with present in respect to the moral aspect of this form of recreation. It is evident that then as now young people were fond of dancing. Both the Methodist and the Roman Catholic[2] Church took an uncompromising attitude towards it. Except among the high society of the military towns, dancing was unrefined; but there is no proof that it was indecent. And while in some communities it was carried to excess, in others it was comparatively infrequent. While every hotel of any pretensions had a ball-room, it did duty for a bedroom most of the time and was in some instances used for its nominal purpose only once a year.[3]

Countless references to shocking profanity of speech appear in the sources of this sketch. But again one questions whether there is anything distinctive here. Mr. Talbot tells us, for instance, that he had "heard more swearing in a week in Canada than in twenty years in Ireland."[4] But it was Irish boatmen near Peterborough whose curses shocked Mrs. Trail.[5] Are we to suppose that these boatmen had learned their expressive vocabulary in Canada? Possibly the wilderness let loose their tongues. The experiences of many wrestlers with new circumstances in Canada were fitted to call forth any profane language they had at

[1] Susannah Moodie, *Roughing it in the Bush*, 1871 edition, p. 132.
[2] Howison, *Sketches*, p. 231.
[3] Howison, *Sketches*, p. 42.
[4] *Five Years*, Vol. ii, p. 126.
[5] *The Backwoods*, p. 63.

their disposal. Anyone who has ploughed new land will recognize what a triumph of self-restraint there is in this laconic note in the diary of a settler near Lancaster,—an American Methodist: "Plowed with horses and got hurt, plowed with oxen."[1]

An early Baptist leader, familiar with backwoods life, has set down what he believes to have been the chief temptations of the early settlers. The statement is sufficiently revealing to warrant the following summary of its contents:

1. Temptations incidental to the sudden escape from service to the fullest liberty.
2. The temptation to overwork, and to overwork their children.
3. The temptation to drink.
4. The temptation to seek office, even by bribery.
5. The temptation to neglect the day of rest.
6. The temptation to abstain from religious service because of the lack of preachers of one's own denomination.
7. The temptation to run into debt.
8. The temptation to be "humbugged by cute friends from over the border."[2]

b. Moral and Spiritual Effects of the Struggle for a Livelihood

1. The observer just quoted is aware of the relaxation in morals incidental to the sudden and complete change in

[1] Shortt, *Life of a Settler*, p. 7.

[2] Edwards, *Correspondence and Papers*, p. 124 f. In connection with the last mentioned occasion of falling, this writer gives some highly interesting instances of what he calls, in the language of the day, the Yankee "shave." In some of these cases the piety of the settler contributed to his undoing, and a meek and sanctimonious agent sold him very bad editions of the *Book of Martyrs* or the *Cottage Bible*, at exorbitant prices. It will be remembered that "American Humor" took its rise in the description of this feature of the life of Nova Scotia in Haliburton's immortal Clockmaker.

environment which the settlers experienced in coming to Canada. He is also aware of another aspect of their new experience, of a very different sort. The great majority of the settlers faced a period of intense struggle for a livelihood. They arrived at a Canadian port with very inadequate information as to how to secure the land they hoped to settle upon. In multitudes of cases they wasted their small surplus of money left over from the ocean passage, in an unprofitable stay in the port of arrival,—Quebec, Montreal, or Halifax,—and reached their farms only to be forced immediately into debt.[1] The inevitable scarcity of produce in the clearings of the first half dozen years, the blunders due to inexperience, and the enormous profits exacted by traders from farmers,[2] were among the frequent causes of hardship. In Prince Edward Island settlers from Dumfriesshire had their first crops, even their potatoes, devoured by mice (1775).[3] In Ontario the army worm destroyed foliage and swarmed like bees.[4]

Weather conditions were sometimes unfavorable to a crop, as in the terrible "Year without a Summer" (1816), after which Nova Scotia potatoes, "blue noses" as they were called, saved the lives of many an impoverished Ontario pioneer.[5] Settlers who for military service or otherwise,

[1] "When I was in Quebec and Montreal I had opportunities of knowing that many of the hovels of these cities contained crowds of British emigrants, who were struggling with those complicated horrors of poverty and disease, whom the hope of being exempted from such evils had induced to abandon the clime of their birth. The greater number of these people when they first landed, had funds enough to carry them to the Upper Province, and even settle them comfortably on their locations, but they knew not where the promised land lay, and were detained in Lower Canada, by anxious and unavailing efforts to obtain correct information upon the subject." Howison, *Sketches*, p. 77.

[2] In New Brunswick importing merchants often made 100% on their expenditures. Baird, *Seventy Years*, pp. 130–131.

[3] Patterson, *Memoir of Rev. James MacGregor*, p. 79.

[4] Smith, *Pioneers*, p. 172.

[5] Smith, *Pioneers of Old Ontario*, p. 171 f.

received Government supplies, passed through an intense crisis when these were withdrawn.[1]

But the people had come to improve their circumstances in the New World, and most of them were determined to fight their way not only to temporary relief, but to economic security. Ordinarily they saw before them a good opportunity of economic rewards. As they could not in their former environments, they were able here to work out their own salvation in this respect. If they were spirited and enterprising, all the conditions called them to intense work. The summer could be spent profitably widening their tillage, the winter in relentless warfare on the forest. Necessity and opportunity could hardly be more completely combined to produce effort. Doubtless many were, by the mere pressure of toil, saved from the relaxation of morals to which other factors tended. As a moral tonic it took the place, in a measure, of the discipline supplied by the Church in Old Land. But many also surrendered to drudgery, and indefinitely postponed all higher interests. A few found the just proportion between toil and productive leisure, in which happiness and well-being so largely consist.[2]

2. With the more ambitious the weekly day of rest was by no means uniformly observed. In some communities a sentiment in favor of the rigid keeping of Sunday prevailed, and would-be violators of the day were largely held in check by public opinion. In Zorra "Maggie Reid would not speak to Miss Ross because Miss Ross washed the dishes on Sunday."[3] But many, the more readily because there were

[1] There was a famine among the Loyalists in 1788 on the withdrawal of the government supplies, which, though not promised, the veterans hoped "Old George" would still maintain. The suffering was widespread and intense. It is described in some detail by Canniff, *Settlement of Upper Canada*, p. 195 f.

[2] For a good description of the busy life of an industrious settler taken from the diary of Benjamin Smith, see Shortt, *Life of a Settler in Western Ontario.*

[3] Mackay, *Pioneer Life in Zorra*, p. 77.

no church services to attend, acquired habits of Sunday labor. Early missionaries found this a hindrance to the inception of their work. A Presbyterian minister in Perth, even in a recently settled community of Highlanders, found about him "a moral as well as a natural wilderness," in which "the Sabbath was awfully profaned" both by indulgence and by labor. People who worked on Sunday looked unfavorably upon the efforts of the Church, and regarded religion "not as a privilege but as a hindrance."[1] From a variety of sources we learn similar facts.[2] A Methodist settler, of exceptional religious zeal, accustomed to "read his book" on Sundays, records one exception to his usual habit, when in stress of harvest work he "took in wheat."[3] In some circumstances it may have been better that they should work on the seventh day than that they should disobey the other portion of the commandment: "Six days shalt thou labor." Yet no doubt the prevalence of the habit of Sunday labor is one indication of a drift to materialism.

3. There come to us from every quarter, indications of the great scantiness of the reading of the pioneers. This was due in part to the scarcity of reading matter, but also in considerable degree to the absorption in other employments. If we are to trust the French *émigré* who visited Canada in 1794, even the existing newspapers, published at Quebec and Niagara, went largely unread.[4] Talbot in five years' experience in Upper Canada saw only two people with books in their hands, and one of these was consulting a

[1] Bell, *Hints to Emigrants*, p. 103, 104.

[2] Talbot, *Five Years' Residence*, Vol. i, p. 125; Gregg, *History of the Presbyterian Church in Canada.*

[3] Shortt, *Life of a Settler*, p. 18.

[4] La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt, *Travels in Upper Canada*, p. 75. La Rochefoucauld had opportunities to observe life in the official and military circles. He believed only two copies of the *Quebec Gazette* were taken in Kingston.

book of remedies for his bodily ills.[1] We read of Nova Scotia in 1830: "The dawn of cultivated education has hardly yet risen upon the Province," and that there is a lack of books and magazines.[2] Many of the settlers were illiterate, and many of those who had formerly had the habit of reading now lost it. One contingent of Prince Edward Island settlers had a supply of books when they arrived; but these were destroyed by the plague of mice.[3] Efforts were made to supply the Scotch settlements of Charlottetown and Pictou with books, but the supply was always limited, and the demand was far from general. In Upper Canada a minister of the Church of England offered books and tracts *gratis* to those who would call for them, but they were not disposed of, the explanation being, according to our informant, that "Canadians do not like to lose time even for such an important matter as that of spiritual instruction."[4]

A modest book trade sprang up in the principal towns, and advertisements of books occurred in all the early newspapers. A large proportion of the titles of books listed in an advertisement in the *Kingston Gazette* for 1812 indicate a religious content. We have seen that insistent and dishonest pedlars succeeded in disposing of a certain number of religious and other books to the farmers. But there can be no doubt that the cultural aspects of life were largely disprized, and that practical cleverness was valued above culture, since it was of more service in the quest for a living and a competence. A writer well disposed toward the settlers says there was "very little reading" as the people

[1] *Five Years' Residence*, Vol. ii, p. 118.

[2] Moorsom, *Letters from Nova Scotia*, p. 96.

[3] Patterson, *Memoir of James McGregor*, p. 84. This scourge had made agriculture wholly unprofitable in the Island in the 1720's and 30's, when it was inhabited by French settlers. See Warburton, *History of Prince Edward Island*, p. 61.

[4] McGrath, *Authentic Letters*, p. 191.

were too weary with toil to spend their evenings in this way.[1]

Comment on this situation must relate itself, however, to contemporary conditions elsewhere. We are dealing with a period earlier than that of the extension of education to the masses in the British Isles. It was never intended in Canada that education should remain permanently in a low state. In this respect a great service was done by the early missionaries, many of whom taught schools, and nearly all of whom encouraged religious reading. Later came the founders of universities and of provincial systems of education, eminent men, and for the most part church leaders of the various denominations.

4. It is charged that in the struggle for a livelihood the pioneers were often guilty of unneighborly selfishness, and even dishonesty. "Gain is their God," says Talbot.[2] To this end all else was subjected. Their interchange of work was done not in a friendly but in a bargaining spirit; and he is prepared to disprove from his own experience that they possessed even the one good quality of hospitality, freely conceded to them by their other critics. Except on the special point of hospitality Howison holds the same views, and goes so far as to say that "the Canadian peasantry are profligate, unamiable, and dishonest."[3] At a date between these two aristocratic writers, we are grateful to Michael Smith, for assuring his American countrymen, even during the War of 1812, that the "main body of the Canadians are peaceable, just and generous."[4]

One factor in the economic life of the period was not conducive to mutual confidence in trade. The system of barter, generally practiced for lack of money, is fitted to call forth

[1] Haight, *Country Life Fifty Years Ago*, p. 181.
[2] *Five Years' Residence*, Vol. ii, p. 69.
[3] *Sketches of Upper Canada*, p. 143.
[4] *Geographical View*, p. 60.

all the gain-loving instincts of humanity, and we may attribute to the influence of this practice some of the alleged covetousness of the settlers.[1] The habit of haggling over prices is not entirely extinct in country stores; but it is practiced only by old people, and seems a residuum from the age of barter. Money has its moral perils, but for the early pioneers the *lack* of money was a root of all evil. Even bets were laid not in money but in kind; *e.g.*, "a blacksmith's bellows against a barrel of molasses." That gambling was universal is the testimony of the hostile critic to whom we have so often referred: by others this is denied.[2] All things considered, it seems improbable that gambling was one of the greater evils of the time.

The history of a people's covetousness may in a measure be found in the records of its courts of law. For Canada these afford scant evidence of a people property-mad. The courts were much employed with cases of assault and battery. Strong drink was usually a factor in such cases.[3] Disputes over property are not, of course, infrequent, and there is some evidence that, owing to distance and costs, litigation was not instituted by all the victims of property encroachments.[4] Many people had the spirit, if not the frankness, of that Yankee land-seeker who when asked by the terrible Colonel Talbot what recommendations he could offer, replied that he had been recommended by the Almighty to get all the land he could.[5] Probably, as often elsewhere, the man who stole the goose from off the common was more harshly dealt with than the greater felon who stole the common from the goose.

[1] This is the opinion of both Talbot and Howison; *Five Years' Residence*, Vol. ii, p. 79; *Sketches*, p. 129.

[2] Talbot, *Five Years' Residence*, Vol. ii, pp. 58–59; M. Smith, *Geographical View*, p. 64.

[3] Smith, *Pioneers*, p. 291; Shortt, *Kingston in the Years of War*.

[4] M. Smith, *Geographical View*, p. 60.

[5] Ermatinger, *The Talbot Régime*, p. 304.

Capital punishment was, by ancient statute, the penalty for grand larceny, but in Upper Canada it was habitually commuted to banishment across the line. This was the penalty for a variety of offences from that of the Methodist minister who in violation of the law performed the marriage ceremony, to the cattle-stealing of 1812 when beef was high. Even in the case of theft of meat on the part of the head of a destitute and starving family, this penalty was inflicted. A ten-year-old Indian boy who had shot his white playmate likewise was forced to become an American.[1] Banishment to the States, we are told, "was a sentence next to that of death felt to be the most severe that could be inflicted."[2] Yet Canadians, even in the old days, looked to the Republic as something other than a criminal colony, and a judge who presumably had sent thither a number of exiles chose to follow them himself and ended his life as an American citizen.[3]

There is of course a kind of economic selfishness that operates within the law, and doubtless thrift often degenerated into greed. But that Canadians were not as a class inhuman and unneighborly wealth-seekers is borne out by many testimonies. Witnesses who cannot be accused of any favorable bias attribute to them hospitality in a high degree.[4]

[1] *Dominion Archives*—(1867); cited by Riddell, *Upper Canada Sketches*, p. 35 f.

[2] Croil, *Dundas*, p. 146.

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] Moorsom, *Letters from Nova Scotia*, p. 142, refers to the customary "hospitality, courtesy, and relief of distress." Fidler says of the Upper Canadians: "I frankly acknowledge that I had no just cause of complaint. . . . I experienced great and general hospitality" (*Observations*, p. 342). See also Howison, *Sketches*, p. 131; Canniff, *Settlement*, p. 625. Kindness to strangers was not always devoid of its embarrassments. We learn that when a Methodist itinerant asked a Glengarry Highland woman with a pail of water in her hand for a drink from her cup, she not only gave him to drink, but strained the water through her soiled handkerchief to remove the wigglers (Carroll, *Case and his Contemporaries*, Vol. i, p. 44).

The response made in times of public calamity was exceedingly generous; witness the Miramichi Fire Relief funds, 1825.[1] The War of 1812 called forth self-denying efforts on a large scale, to relieve the suffering families of the patriots.[2] The cholera scourge of 1832 found not only clergy and medical doctors, but neighbors and the public generally exhibiting a fine loyalty and rendering every possible service to the sufferers.[3] Community life was full of incidents in which timely aid was disinterestedly rendered. Major Strickland found on returning from a journey incidental to the funeral of his wife, that his fields were green with grain sown in his absence by a generous neighbor.[4] The history of the early days is replete with proofs that the law of kindness triumphed over the temptations of greed.

5. In Canada conscience and economic conditions caused the early abolition of slavery. Slavery was introduced into Canada during the French period,[5] and there is evidence of occasional sales of negroes in Nova Scotia from the foundation of Halifax.[6] With the Loyalists there was a considerable influx of slaves, and this was legalized by an act of the British Parliament of 1790. The second session of the Assembly of Upper Canada, in 1793 legislated against slavery. The Act of 1793 forbade the importation of "any negro or other person to be subjected to the conditions of a

[1] Cooney, *Compendious History of the Northern Part of the Province of New Brunswick*, p. 82.

[2] See Kingsford, *The History of Canada*, Vol. viii (1895), p. 235 f.

[3] See the vivid account in Smith, *Pioneers*, p. 327 f.; and Fidler, *Observations*, p. 280 f.

[4] *Twenty-seven Years*, Vol. i, p. 106.

[5] There were in Lower Canada 304 slaves in 1784. Canniff, *Settlement*, p. 569 f.

[6] *The Halifax Gazette* in 1769 contains this advertisement: "On Saturday next at 12 o'clock will be sold on the Beach, 2 hogsheads of rum, 3 of sugar, and 2 well-grown negro girls . . . to the highest bidder." Quoted by T. W. Smith, *The Slave in Canada*, p. 10. This author finds 1232 negroes, mostly slaves, brought to the Maritime Provinces by 1784 (p. 32).

slave," and freed on coming of age the children of existing slaves. Canniff belives that the last vestige of slavery passed in 1835. Advertisements regarding slaves appear in the Niagara papers in 1802. Efforts in Lower Canada to secure legal control of slaves failed to become law, and slavery had almost ceased to exist before the Imperial Emancipation Act of 1833.[1] Slaves frequently escaped into Canada from the United States, and were often pursued by the agents of their owners, and in some cases kidnapped and taken off again. A particularly brutal instance of this, in which a negro girl was the victim, took place about 1830 at Queenstown without calling forth the chivalrous intervention of the people that might have been expected.[2] Canada has however been singularly free from trouble over the small colored element of her population.

III. Religious Destitution

(*a*) *The Lack of Religious Ordinances.*

1. The early Protestant settlers in Canada experienced what the prophet Amos described as "a famine of hearing the words of the Lord." The Churches of Great Britain were not prompt to follow the migrating thousands with anything like adequate provision for the ministrations of religion. So far did settlement outstrip church organization that, till at least as late as 1830, there existed in all the provinces large churchless communities. Needless to say, there was a corresponding decline of religious instruction and of religious habits.

The efforts of organized Protestantism in Canada were at first largely by expansion from the older colonies, afterwards the United States. Before the Revolutionary War

[1] Canniff, *Settlement of Upper Canada*, p. 569 f.

[2] Mackenzie, *Sketches of Canada and the United States*, p. 21. *Cf.* Mrs. Moodie's story of a negro married to a native girl, who was ridden on a rail and died (*Roughing it in the Bush*, p. 252).

both New England Congregationalists and Scottish Presbyterians in Nova Scotia felt strongly the influence of New England in their ministry. The first Presbyterian minister in the Province was a Princeton graduate. He was sent by the Presbytery of New Brunswick, N. J., in response to an urgent invitation from Truro, N. S., "stating in strong terms the destitute circumstances in which the petitioners were placed in regard to the gospel."[1] The Scottish Secession Churches soon began to send missionaries, but the Church of Scotland was not vigorous or interested enough to show much activity until the foundation of the Glasgow Colonial Society, 1825. The Revolutionary War severed church relations with New England, and this was of special importance for the decline of Congregationalism in Nova Scotia. Many of the New England trained ministers of the Congregational settlers sympathized with the revolting colonies. One of them, Seth Noble of Maugerville, N. B., corresponded with Washington and conspired in a fruitless local uprising in 1775.[2] During the war period the fiery evangelist Henry Alline put the whole province in a religious ferment: he died of consumption at 36 in 1784.[3] He was not college bred, and his crude opinions led some of his followers to antinomian views.[4] Alline tolerated, without adopting, adult baptism, and when the war removed the former pastors, new leaders arose who propagated Baptist principles. Many of the Baptist founders of the Maritime Provinces were men who had come from New England to enjoy the larger liberty allowed them in Nova Scotia.

[1] Gregg, *History of Presbyterianism in Canada*, p. 60.

[2] He fled to the revolting colonies and many years later sent to his old congregation a bill for his salary during the period of his absence. Hannay, *History of New Brunswick*, Vol. ii, p. 388.

[3] *The Life and Journal of the Reverend Mr. Henry Alline*, Boston, 1806. This book presents a remarkable record of the psychology of conversions.

[4] Marsden, *Narrative of a Mission*, p. 49, records conversations with some of these people.

In Upper Canada American influences prevailed till the War of 1812. The earliest of the Church of England worthies here was John Stuart of Kingston, a Loyalist (and former Presbyterian) from Pennsylvania. Presbyterianism was represented by Robert Macdowell sent by the Dutch Reformed Classis of Albany. The early Methodist itinerants were likewise American. The Established Churches of Great Britain were slow to assert their strength. It will be recalled that no bishop of the Church of England was appointed to the American colonies till after the Revolution: the date of the first appointment for Nova Scotia was 1787. Roughly speaking Protestant organization had to find new beginnings in the Maritime Provinces at the close of the Revolutionary War, in the Canadas at the close of the War of 1812.

2. It is safe to say that at no stage before 1830 did the ministry of the principal denominations collectively reach sufficient numerical strength to accomplish more than a fraction of the work that was calling for their services.

It is difficult to present accurate statistics in the matter, but the following facts will, with allowance for inevitable inaccuracies, establish the statement just made. Let us first take Upper Canada in 1820. According to a survey contained in a report written in that year to Nathan Bangs, by Messrs. Ryan and Case, Methodist missionaries, the ministers of the leading Protestant denominations in the Province numbered 82, consisting of: Church of England, 16; Presbyterian and Congregationalist, 15; Baptist, 18; Methodist, 33.[1] In 1822 the population of Upper Canada was officially estimated at 126,000,[2] of whom we are justified in placing the Protestants at approximately 100,000. If we place their number in 1820 at only 90,000, we find that the

[1] Playter, *History of Methodism in Canada*, p. 192.
[2] *Canadian Archives*, Pamphlet 1443.

ministry (82) stands to the people in the ratio of about .9 per thousand.

An estimate of the Presbyterians in the Maritime Provinces made in 1825 was 50,000, and their ministers are said to have numbered 40, a ratio of .8 per thousand.[1] In 1827 the Church of England was credited in the census report with 28,659 adherents. In 1829 Haliburton lists 26 ministers: if the body had grown to 30,000 at this time, the ratio would just fall short of .9 per thousand. The Methodists who reported 9408 in 1827, had in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island 19 missionaries in 1829,[2] and were thus evidentally more adequately supplied. Their ministry however, was to all society. On the whole it seems evident that the ratio of Protestant ministers to people was distinctly less than one per thousand.

To understand the meaning of these statistics, it may be useful to compare them with those of the present day in the Dominion of Canada. According to 1922 Year Books, there were 1,407,959 adherents of the Church of England reported in the 1921 census, and these had 1595 ministers (not including lay leaders) in 1922, 5 dioceses not reporting. The total is probably around 2000, which yields a ratio of 1.5 per thousand. The Methodists had 2536 ministers, 1,158,744 adherents, a ratio of 2.4 per thousand. The Presbyterians had 1964 ministers with 1,408,812 people, or 1.4 per thousand. The Baptists 777 ministers, 421,730 people, or 1.8 per thousand. The 4,397,245 Protestants of these denominations, had 7,277 ministers or a ratio of about 1.7 per 1,000. These comparisons in themselves abundantly prove that the fields, undermanned to-day, were sadly undermanned a century ago.

[1] *Glasgow Colonial Society, First Report*, 1826, Supplement, p. 15.

[2] Haliburton, *Historical and Statistical Account*, Vol. ii, p. 302 f. There were a number of Methodist circuits in Prince Edward Island. See Warburton, *History of Prince Edward Island*, p. 308.

But one must consider in addition the vast areas concerned—relatively to population much greater than to-day —the impossibility of rapid travel, the lack of equipment and the thousand discomforts and hindrances due to primitive conditions, that reduced the efficiency of the individual worker as compared with his successor of to-day. The heroic conflict with these hindrances, constitutes the romance of pioneer missions in Canada.

The Church authorities of the homelands lacked initiative and imagination, or were too much concerned over pressing problems at home to give adequate leadership in Canada. It would be easy to fill pages with the pleas sent home from neglected communities and the regretful statements of early observers of the inadequacy of the missionary staff. "A moral wilderness"; "sheep having no shepherd"; "perishing for lack of knowledge" are among the oft-repeated phrases of letters sent to the Glasgow Colonial Society. A Methodist itinerant in 1816 describes the people of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick as "a people hungering and thirsting for the bread and water of life, without temple, minister or ordinances."[1] An Anglican writer in 1824, after somewhat inaccurately enumerating the missionaries of Upper Canada, exclaims: "What are they among so many?"[2] In what was then Western Canada (west of York), there lay wide areas rapidly filling with settlers, but almost untouched by the churches, in which, says an Anglican layman writing in 1833, "there are young families that have never been baptized and I am credibly informed that there are fathers and mothers, nay, grandfathers and grandmothers, who have never been received by baptism into the Church of Christ."[3] It is impossible to judge the total result to the early population

[1] Marsden, *Narrative of a Mission*, p. 37.
[2] Talbot, *Five Years' Residence*, Vol. ii, p. 141.
[3] McGrath, *Authentic Letters* p. 191.

of Canada of this widespread famine of religious ordinances. It continued with other factors to the disadvantage of the moral and spiritual life of the early settlers. As one of the best informed students of this pioneer society remarks: "The earnest contest for life, the daily struggle for food, and more especially the absence of ministers of the gospel all combined to create a feeling of indifference, if not a looseness of morals."[1]

3. In churchless communities, even with the best of intentions on the part of the original settlers, the tendency to irreligion and general retrogression inevitably set in with the first native generation. This fact is set forth in the words of the shrewd worldling, "Tiger" Dunlop:

> The original settler retains the religious impressions he brought with him from home, and so far as in him lies instils them into his children; but those children, never having been brought up in the public observance of the Sabbath, find that it is not at all necessary for their comfort. . . . A population arises destitute of reverence for either God or man, and ruffian violence takes the place of law, and dissolute licentiousness that of morality, and man retrogrades from a civilized to a worse than savage state.[2]

Talbot illustrates the sheer religious ignorance which he finds general among native Canadians by a story of two hunters, one of British and one of Canadian birth, who were lost in the woods and in prospect of death. The former was anxious about the future life; the latter only lest his body should be torn by wolves.[3] Nothing of course, is more commonplace than the lamentation of the aged over the impiety of the young; but in a community devoid of

[1] Canniff, *Settlement of Upper Canada*, p. 276.

[2] From a letter written in Feb., 1827, and given in the *Second Report of the Glasgow Colonial Society*, 1828.

[3] *Five Years' Residence in Upper Canada*, Vol. i, p. 203.

those inspiring and correcting forces which centre in the Church, there is some historic significance in the picture, described by himself, of a settler in Lanark, the father of a family, sitting with grave concern over a dying fire after the rest had gone to bed, the burden of his mournful reverie being: "O what will become of the rising generation?"[1]

Death was a frequent and often a sudden visitor in the backwoods, and funerals could not be postponed till the coming of a minister. Many are the touching and saddening accounts of bereavement, and the funeral incidents that have been preserved. In times of epidemic disease, the most terrible being the visitation of cholera in 1832, the dead were so numerous that they had to be buried by contract without funeral rite of any sort.[2] Instances occurred in private life in which after an accident the dead were laid away in the ground with the least possible interruption of work.[3] The customs in regard to caring for the corpse, wakes, and burial, were in large measure those of the countries from which the settlers came.[4]

The funeral service, if there was any, was simplicity itself: neighbors bore the pine coffin to the burial place. "The rude coffin being placed in the grave, those present would uncover, and the father," (here our authority assumes what so often happened, the death of the young) "in sad tones would make a few remarks about the departed, offer a few thoughts which the occasion suggested, and then the coffin was hidden out of sight. The men would return to their labors and the women to their

[1] *Glasgow Colonial Society, Fourth Report*, 1830, App. V.

[2] Smith, *Pioneers of Old Ontario*, p. 330.

[3] Mrs. Moodie, *Roughing it in the Bush*, 1871 ed., p. 132.

[4] Mackay, *Pioneer Life of Zorra*, p. 198. See the positively gruesome account of a death scene witnessed by Howison in a hovel of the Niagara district. With the aid of a bottle of spirits, friends laid out the corpse, after which the women came in and put a Bible under the head and a plate of salt upon the breast. *Sketches*, p. 122,

duties."[1] There being no churches and no churchyards, the place of burial was either on the farm of the departed, or in a community burial ground that developed around the first grave of the settlement.[2]

4. The absence of religious instruction left room for the free development of superstition. People might neglect the weightier matters of the law, but they planted and reaped, butchered, made soap, and weaned their babies according to the phases of the moon.[3] Ghosts were frequently encountered, and, it seems, could be best discerned by those whose eyes had been opened with drink. But they were sometimes dispelled by bold unbelievers.[4] The Acadian who murdered two Englishmen and died unshriven, reappeared in the form of a wild goose.[5] There lived here and there in the wilderness a witch of terrible powers. One near New Dundee, Upper Canada, possessed the sixth and seventh books of Moses! Witch doctors and spell-making quacks, were consulted for illness in man or beast. In much of this there is a distinct Old World touch. German settlers placed the names of Caspar, Melchior and Belthazar over doors to keep out witches.[6] Dogs howling to the moon, foretold death. But the New World had its own spiritual terrors. The frogs that lifted their chorus from every pool, the wild beasts and birds, were sometimes thought of in terms of the supernatural. A hawk that had

[1] Canniff, *Settlement of Upper Canada*, p. 245.

[2] Scherk, *Pen Pictures*, p. 90; Canniff, *Settlement*, p. 243 f. Canniff attributes this practice to the Dutch, and finds it duplicated in New York State, and especially at Hoboken, N. J. But the present writer has in mind numerous instances in communities in which no Dutch influence can be traced.

[3] Haight, *Country Life in Canada Fifty Years Ago*, p. 98; Scherk, *Pen Pictures*, p. 91.

[4] Mackay, *Pioneer Life in Zorra*, p. 211 f.

[5] J. McGregor, *Historical and Descriptive Sketches of the Maritime Provinces*, p. 177.

[6] Winternberg, "German Canadian Folklore," *Ontario Historical Society Publications*, Vol. iii, p. 86.

been wounded and was thought dead, was taken into a room, and on recovering consciousness exhibited such fiendish qualities that it was mistaken for the devil.[1] The early folklore of Nova Scotia bears resemblances to that of the Micmacs,[2] and may have been influenced by Indian tales.

There is nothing very original or distinctive about the folklore of the Canadian settlers. But it is clear that where religious teaching was absent, superstitions were the more readily cultivated, and took a more important place in the life of the people than would otherwise have been the case.

(*b*) *Family and Public Religion before Church Organization.*

1. But the picture has been only partially drawn. While the majority of the early communities suffered in religion and morals by the conditions that have just been noted, there were some settlers to whom religion was so vital an experience and in whom religious habits were so ingrained, that they retained in the interval the practices of family religion, and even inaugurated some form of public worship. It appears that most of the Scotch settlers of Oxford County retained the habits of morning and evening home worship, of grace after meals, and of parting and meeting with a blessing. No pressure of work was allowed to interrupt these observances; and we learn of an instance in which, to the consternation of the hired man roused up from scant sleep, thanks were offered for the light of another day two hours before daybreak.[3] In a recently published history of Prince Edward Island the later rapid growth of the Presbyterian Church there is attributed to the fact that Bible

[1] The enraged bird played up to the part, and tore the clothing of a servant woman as she fled from the place. Baird, *Seventy Years of New Brunswick Life*, p. 38.

[2] Shaw, "The Vanishing Folklore of Nova Scotia," *Dalhousie Review*, Oct., 1923.

[3] Mackay, *Pioneer Life in Zorra*, p. 47.

reading and catechizing were maintained in the settlers' homes from the beginning.[1] In Nova Scotia Methodism took its rise from quickenings in household prayer meetings.[2] In Upper Canada, in the Bay of Quinte region, Methodism existed twelve years before the first itinerant arrived.[3]

2. While the churches were making slow beginnings, Sunday Schools were being introduced. In some places they were undertaken years before there was any prospect of church organization. For some years prior to 1776, James Davidson kept a Sunday School at Lyon's Brook, Pictou.[4] This pioneer school was, of course, earlier than the experiment of Robert Raikes, the reputed originator of the modern Sunday School. At Elizabethtown (Brockville) a community Sunday School was carried on by laymen for years before the settlement of a minister.[5] One was organized in Kingston in 1817, which has been mistakenly regarded as the earliest in Upper Canada.[6] "More than forty" schools in the Upper Canada district were reported by presiding elder Case in 1822.[7] In 1824 the Parliament of Upper Canada set apart a small sum for their promotion, and by that year they were common in the older settlements.[8] While Methodists were very active in their organization, many of the schools were non-denominational. A Scotch Presbyterian visited Prince Edward Island in 1820 and 1821, for the purpose of founding community Sunday Schools. He was not the agent of his own or of any Church, but endeavored to reimburse him-

[1] Warburton, *History of Prince Edward Island*, p. 400.

[2] T. W. Smith, *Methodism in Eastern British America*, Vol. i, p. 81 f.

[3] Webster, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada*, p. 30.

[4] Patterson, *History of Pictou County*, p. 69.

[5] I owe this information to the Rev. Robert Laird, D.D. *Cf.* Gregg, *History of the Presbyterian Church in Canada*, p. 193.

[6] Canniff, *Settlement of Upper Canada*, p. 308.

[7] Playter, *History of Methodism in Canada*, p. 208.

[8] Canniff, *op. cit.*, p. 309; Playter, *op. cit.*, p. 228.

self by the publication of letters describing the Province. In this way he has left a highly valuable description of pioneer life, in which the element of religious destitution is impressively presented. He was instrumental, with the aid of lay leaders, in the founding of a number of schools, but on the whole his work was a disappointment.[1]

3. In some instances public worship was undertaken, and religion given some sort of local organization, in a purely spontaneous effort on the part of the religiously minded among the settlers. The Scotch Baptists of Breadalbane, Argenteuil County, instituted their own church, setting apart two of their number as ministers.[2] In the journal of a settler near Peterborough, it is recorded, under date of 1836, that "Before the erection of a church, and since, when no duly appointed minister can be procured, one or other of the educated settlers have always been accustomed to read prayers and a sermon to the rest."[3] Military officers were accustomed on occasion to make use of the English Church service. Major Strickland records reading the service at a blacksmith's funeral.[4] Col. Thomas Talbot, the benevolent despot of Middlesex County, maintained public worship at St. Thomas.[5]

The first settlers at Pictou numbered among them a group of church elders who inaugurated Sunday services while they petitioned God and the Anti-Burgher Synod for a minister. "The exercises in these meetings consisted of prayer and praise, and especially reading the Scriptures and religious works." Hence they were called "Readings."[6]

[1] Johnstone, *Travels in Prince Edward Island.*

[2] One of these proved a Calvinist, the other an Arminian, a circumstance that led to a division of the congregation. Sketch of the History of the Churches, in *Minutes of the Fiftieth Meeting of the Ottawa Baptist Association*, p. 20.

[3] *Six Years in the Bush*, p. 118.

[4] *Twenty Seven Years in Canada West*, Vol. ii, p. 174.

[5] Ermatinger, *The Talbot Régime*, p. 270.

[6] Patterson, *Memoirs of James McGregor*, p. 84.

In Cavendish, Prince Edward Island, a group of leading families "were able to conduct intelligently among themselves religious services, and did so until they obtained a pastor of their own."[1] In another part of the Island Province settlers (from Dumfriesshire) had imported some religious books. These were for the most part destroyed by the plague of mice which made repeated visitations to the province in the eighteenth century;[2] but Boston's *Four Fold State* proved too tough for the rodents; they left it damaged but not destroyed, and the mutilated copy of this classic was made to do service at many a pious gathering.[3]

In 1824 a Paisley man, settled in Caledon, Upper Canada, wrote to the Glasgow Colonial Society:

> You wish to know how we spend the Sabbath in Caledon, to which I answer that we all assemble at eleven o'clock, forenoon, in the house of J. McD., when we commence our religious service with prayer and praise, after which a chapter of the Bible is read. We next read one of Burder's *Village Sermons;* after the sermon is read the children are catechized, and the service concludes as it began with prayer and praise.[4]

The minister of a pioneer church in New Brunswick writes in the same year:

> In some places, even in the wilderness where preachers have never yet been sent, is regularly heard the public voice of psalms and of prayer and of exhortation.[5]

One is led to think that such praiseworthy lay efforts were fairly widespread, though by no means universal. Such groups in each denomination of Christians formed

[1] MacLeod, *History of Presbyterianism in Prince Edward Island*, p. 21.
[2] Warburton, *History of Prince Edward Island*, p. 61.
[3] Patterson, *Memoirs of James McGregor*, p. 84.
[4] *Glasgow Colonial Society, First Report*, p. 16.
[5] *Ibid.*

nuclei for the organization of the churches when that became possible; meanwhile they held many of the outposts for religion and decency, and kept alive the expectation of a better day.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I am indebted to Mrs. H. A. Innes for the use of notes taken by her in the Canadian Archives, and to Rev. C. J. Cameron for access to materials in his custody on the history of Canadian Baptist Missions.

ATKINS, THOMAS B., *Sketch of the Rise and Progress of the Church of England in British North America*, Halifax, 1849.

ALLISON, D., Notes on "A General Return of the Several Townships in the Province of Nova Scotia for the First Day of January, 1767," in *Nova Scotia Historical Society Publications* Vol. II. Halifax, 1891.

BAIRD, WM. T., *Seventy Years of New Brunswick Life*, St. John, 1890.

BANGS, NATHAN, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, 4 vols. (Vol. I, New York, 1860.)

Banner, The (weekly), Toronto, 1842–1847.

BELL, WM., *Hints to Emigrants in a Series of Letters from Upper Canada*, Edin. 1824.

BETTRIDGE, WILLIAM, *Brief History of the Church in Upper Canada*, London, 1838.

BILL, INGRAHAM E., *Fifty Years with the Baptist Ministers and Churches of the Maritime Provinces of Canada*, St. John, 1880.

BURNS, GEO., *Lectures and Sermons delivered in the Scots Church of St. John*, St. John, 1820.

BURTIS, W. R. M., *Prize Essay on the History of New Brunswick*, St. John, 1837.

The Canada Constellation, Niagara, 1799–1801.

CANNIFF, WILLIAM, *A History of the Settlement of Upper Canada (Ontario) with Special Reference to the Bay of Quinte*, Toronto, 1869.

CARNOCHAN, JANET, *Two Frontier Churches*, a paper read before the Canadian Institute of Niagara, 1890; Niagara, 189(?).

CARROLL, JOHN, *Past and Present; A Description of Persons and Events connected with Canadian Methodism*, Toronto, 1860.

CARTER, J. SMYTH, *History of Dundas County*, Iroquois, 1905.

Censuses of Canada, 1665 to 1881. *Statistics of Canada*. Vol. IV. Ottawa, 1876.

CHURCHILL, CHARLES, *Memorials of a Missionary Life in Nova Scotia*, London, 1845.

CLENDENNAN, D. W., "Some Presbyterian U. E. Loyalists," in *Ont. Hist. Soc. Publications*. Vol. III (1901), p. 117 f.

[COONEY, ROBERT.] *Autobiography of a Wesleyan Preacher, formerly a Roman Catholic*, Montreal, 1856.

COONEY, ROBERT, *A Compendious History of the Northern Half of the Province of New Brunswick and of the District of Gaspe in Lower Canada*, Halifax, 1832.

COX, F. A. and HOBY, J., *The Baptists in America*, New York, 1836.

CRAIGHEAD, J. G., *Scotch and Irish Seeds in American Soil*, Phila., 1878.

CROIL, JAMES, *Dundas, or a Sketch of Canadian History and more particularly the County of Dundas, containing Notices of Churches in the County*, Montreal, 1861.

CUMBERLAND, R. W., "Pioneer Problems in Upper Canada," *Queen's Quarterly*. Vol. XXXI, No. 2, 1923.

DAVIN, N. F., *The Irishman in Canada*, Toronto, 1877.

DAY, MRS. C. M., *History of the Eastern Townships, Province of Quebec, Dominion of Canada*, Montreal, 1869.

DENT, JOHN CHARLES, *Story of the Upper Canadian Rebellion*, 2 vols., Toronto, 1885.

Doctrine and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada, York, 1829.

DUNLOP, WM., *Recollections of the War of 1812*, 2nd ed., Toronto, 1908.

EDWARDS, WM., *Correspondence and Papers of Wm. Edwards*, Peterborough, 1882.

ERMATINGER, C. O., *The Talbot Régime*, St. Thomas, 1904.

FERGUSON, A., *Practical Notes made during a Tour in Canada and a Portion of the United States in MDCCCXXXI*, 2nd ed., Edin., 1834.

FIDLER, I., *Observations on Professions, Literature, Manners and Emigration in the United States and Canada, made during a Residence there in 1832*, London, 1833.

FITCH, E. R., *The Baptists of Canada*, Toronto, 1911.

GANONG, WM. F., "A Monograph on the Origins of Settlements in the Province of New Brunswick." Trans. Roy. Soc. of Can., June, 1904. Sect. II, p. 3 ff.

GESNER, ABRAHAM, *New Brunswick, with Notes for Emigrants*, London, 1847.

GRAHAM, HENRY G., *Social Life of Scotland in the eighteenth century* (1899), 2nd ed., London, 1909.

GRANT, W. L., *Ontario High School History of Canada*, Toronto, 1914.

GRAY, HUGH, *Letters from Canada written during a residence there in the years 1806, 1807 and 1808*, London, 1809.

HAIGHT, CANNIFF, *Country Life in Canada Fifty Years Ago*, Toronto, 1885.

HALIBURTON, THOMAS C., *An Historical and Statistical Account of Nova Scotia*, 2 vols., Halifax, 1829.

Halifax Monthly Magazine. Vol. I, 1830–31.

HANNAY, JAMES, *The History of Acadia from the first Discovery to the Surrender to England by the Treaty of Paris*, St. John, 1879.

HANNAY, James, *The History of New Brunswick*, 2 vols., St. John, 1909.

HATHEWAY, C. L., *The History of New Brunswick from its First Settlement*, Fredericton, 1846.

HAWKINS, ERNEST, *Historical Notices of the Missions of the Church of England in the North American Colonies previous to the Independence of the United States*, London, 1845.

HENRY, MRS. P. A., *Memoir of the Rev. Thomas Henry, Christian Minister, York Pioneer, and Soldier of 1812*, Toronto, 1880.

HIGGINS, W. H., *Life and Times of Joseph Gould*, Toronto, 1887.

HILTS, J. H., *Experiences of a Backwoods Preacher*, Toronto, 1887.

HOLLINGWORTH, S., *The Present State of Nova Scotia with a Brief Account of Canada and the British Islands on the Coast of North America*, 2nd ed., 1787.

HOWISON, JOHN, *Sketches of Upper Canada, Domestic, Social, and Characteristic*, Edin., 1821.

HUNTER, A. F., "The Ethnographical Elements of Ontario." *Ont. Hist. Soc. Publications*. Vol. III, 1901, p. 180 f.

JACK, D. R., *History of the City and County of St. John*, St. John, 1883.

JOHNSTONE, WALTER, *A Series of Letters Descriptive of Prince Edward Island in the Gulph of St. Lawrence addressed to the Rev. John Wightman*, Dumfries, 1822.

JOHNSTONE, WALTER, *Travels in Prince Edward Island, Gulf of St. Lawrence, North America, in the years 1820–1821, undertaken with a design to establish Sabbath Schools, etc.*, Edin., 1823.

KINGSFORD, WM., *The Early Bibliography of the Province of Ontario*, Toronto & Montreal, 1892.

KINGSFORD, WILLIAM, *The History of Canada*, 10 vols., Toronto, 1887–1898.

KIRBY, WM., *The United Empire Loyalists of Canada, illustrated by Memorials of the Servos Family*, Toronto, 1884.

LANGTRY, J., *History of the Church in Eastern Canada and Newfoundland*, London and N. Y., 1892.

LAWSON, JOHN, *Letters on Prince Edward Island*, Charlottetown, 1851.

Letter to the Rt. Honorable the Earl of Liverpool relative to the Rights of the Church of Scotland in British North America, from a Protestant of the Church of Scotland, Kingston, 1826.

LIZARS, ROBINA, and V. M., *In the Days of the Canada Company*, Toronto, 1896.

MCCULLOUGH, WILLIAM, *Life of Thomas McCullough, edited by his granddaughters*, Truro, 1920.

MACDOUGALL, J. L., *History of Inverness County, Nova Scotia*, Strathborne, N. S., 1922.

MACFARLANE, W. G., *New Brunswick Bibliography; the Books and Writers of the Province*, St. John, 1895.

MCGREGOR, J., *Historical and Descriptive Sketches of the Maritime Provinces*, London, 1828.

MCGREGOR, JOHN, *British America*, 2 vols., London, 1833.

MACKAY, W. A., *Pioneer Life in Zorra*, Toronto, 1899.

MACKENZIE, WM. L., *Sketches of Canada and the United States*, London, 1833.

MACLEOD, J., *History of Presbyterian in Prince Edward Island*, Chicago, 1904.

MARSDEN, JOSHUA, *Narrative of a Mission to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and the Somers Islands with a Tour of Lake Ontario*, Plymouth Dock, 1816.

MELISH, JOHN, *Travels in the United States of North America . . . and Travels through various parts of Great Britain, Ireland, and Upper Canada*, Phila., 1812.

MOODIE, SUSANNAH, *Roughing it in the Bush*, Toronto, 1871.

MOORSOM, W., *Letters from Nova Scotia comprising Sketches of a Young Country*, London., 1830.

MOUNTAIN, GEORGE G., *Journal of Visitation in a Part of the Diocese of Quebec by the Lord Bishop of Montreal in the Spring of 1843*, London, 1847.

MURDOCH, BEAMISH, *A History of Nova Scotia or Acadia*, 3 vols., Halifax, 1867.

New Brunswick Religious and Literary Journal. Vols. I, II. St. John, 1829.

[OGDEN, J. C.] *A Tour through Upper and Lower Canada by a Citizen of the United States*, Litchfield, 1799.

PARKER, DAVID W., *A Guide to the Documents in the Manuscript Room at the Public Archives of Canada.* Vol. I, Ottawa, 1914.

PATTERSON, GEORGE, *A History of the County of Pictou, Nova Scotia,* Montreal, 1877.

PLAYTER, GEO. F., *The History of Methodism in Canada,* 2 vols., Toronto, 1862.

Practical Advice to Emigrants on all points connected with their comfort and economy, London, 1834.

PROUDFOOT, WM., "The Proudfoot Papers, Pt. I" in *London & Middlesex Historical Society,* ed. Harriet Priddis, London, Ont., 1915,

RATTRAY, W. J., *The Scot in British North America,* 4 vols., Toronto, 1880.

READ, D. B., *Life and Times of General John Graves Simcoe,* Toronto, *1890.*

Review of Historical Publications relating to Canada. Ed. by G. M. Wrong, H. H. Langton, and W. S. Wallace.

RIDDELL, WM. R., *Upper Canada Sketches,* Toronto, 1922.

ROBERTSON, JAMES, *History of the Mission of the Secession Church to Nova Scotia & Prince Edward Island from its commencement in 1765,* Edin., 1847.

LA ROCHEFOUCAULD-LIANCOURT, "Travels in Upper Canada, 1795," in *Thirteenth Report of the Bureau of Archives for the Province of Ontario,* Toronto, 1917.

RYERSON, EGERTON, *The Clergy Reserve Question. . . . Letters to W. H. Draper,* Toronto, 1839.

SANDERSON, J. E., *The First Century of Methodism in Canada,* Vol. I, 1775–1839, Toronto, 1908.

SCADDING, HENRY, *Toronto of Old,* Toronto, 1873.

[SCHERK, MICHAEL G.] *Pen Pictures of Early Pioneer Life in Canada by a Canuck of the Fifth Generation,* Toronto, 1905.

SHAW, BEATRICE, M. H., "The Vanishing Folklore of Nova Scotia," *Dalhousie Review,* Oct. 1923, p. 342 f.

SHORTT, ADAM, "Early Records of Ontario, extract from the Records of the Court of Quarter Sessions for the District of Mechlenburgh (afterwards the Midland District)" in *Queen's Quarterly*. Vol. 7, 1899–1900, p. 50 f.; Vol. 9, 1901–1902, p. 130 f.

SHORTT, ADAM, "Life in Kingston the Year after Waterloo," *Queen's Quarterly*. Vol. 8, 1900–1901, p. 189 f.

SHORTT, ADAM, "Life of a Settler in Western Canada before the War of 1812," *Queen's University Bulletin of Dept. of History and Political Science*, Kingston, 1914.

SHORTT, ADAM & DOUGHTY, ARTHUR G., *Canada and Its Provinces*, 23 vols., Edin., 1914–1917.

Six Years in the Bush, Extracts from the Journal of a Settler in Upper Canada, 1832–1838, London, 1838.

SMART, MRS. WM., "Diary of Rev. William Smart" in *Archives of the Presbyterian Church in Canada*, Toronto.

SMITH, MICHAEL, *Geographical View of the Province of Upper Canada*, 3rd ed., revised, Trenton, 1813.

SMITH, W. L., *Pioneers of Old Ontario*.

Society (in Connection with the Established Church of Scotland) for promoting the Religious Interests of Scottish Settlers in British North America, *Reports*, Glasgow, 1826–1838.

STEWART, JOHN, *An Account of Prince Edward Island in the Gulph of St. Lawrence*, London, 1806.

STRACHAN, JOHN, *A Journal of Visitation to the Western Portion of his Diocese by the Lord Bishop of Toronto in the Autumn of 1842*, 3rd ed., London, 1846.

STRACHAN, JOHN, *Letter to the Honorable the Earl of Selkirk*, London, 1816.

STRACHAN, JOHN, *Letter to the Rt. Honorable Lord John Russel on the Present State of the Church in Canada*, Toronto, 18(?).

STRICKLAND, (MAJOR), *Twenty-seven Years in Canada West*, 2 vols. (in one), London, 1853.

SUTHERLAND, GEORGE, *A Manual of the Geography and Natural and Civil History of Prince Edward Island*, Charlottetown, 1861.

Talbot, Edward Allen, *Five Years Residence in the Canadas including a tour through part of the United States of America in the year 1823*, 2 vols., London, 1824.

Thomas, C., *History of the Counties of Argenteuil and Prescott*, Montreal, 1896.

Thompson, Samuel, *Reminiscences of a Canadian Pioneer for the last Fifty Years*, Toronto, 1884.

Traill, Catherine Parr, *The Backwoods of Canada, being letters from the wife of an emigrant officer*, London, 1846.

Traill, Henry Duff, *Social England, a Record of the Progress of the People*, 6 vols., London and N. Y., 1901–1904.

Wallace, W. Stewart, "The Family Compact," *Chronicles of Canada Series*, ed. G. M. Wrong and H. H. Langton. Vol. 24, Toronto, 1915.

Wallace, W. Stewart, "The United Empire Loyalists," *Chronicles of Canada Series*, ed. G. M. Wrong, No. 13, Toronto.

Warburton, A. B., *A History of Prince Edward Island (1534–1831)*, St. John, 1923.

Webster, Thomas, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada*, Hamilton, 1870.

Winternberg, W. J., "German Canadian Folklore," *Ontario Historical Society Publications*. Vol. III, p. 86 f. (1901).

Unidentified Sermons of Severian, Bishop of Gabala

By
Herbert T. Weiskotten

UNIDENTIFIED SERMONS OF SEVERIAN, BISHOP OF GABALA

By Rev. Herbert T. Weiskotten, Ph.D., Pastor of the English Lutheran Church of the Redeemer, Brooklyn, N. Y.

(*Read December 27, 1920*)

INCLUDED in one of the volumes of the sermons of John Chrysostom in the *Patrologia Græca*[1] are seven sermons ascribed to one Severian, Bishop of Gabala. Besides these there are two more sermons ascribed to him in two other volumes of the *Patrologia.*[2] Bardenhewer[3] names thirteen sermons as genuine, thereby adding four to the list. Accepting these temporarily as genuine, the question to be investigated is whether an examination of these and a comparison with the *Spuria* attached to the sermons of Chrysostom may not bring further sermons to light.

Before entering into this, a brief sketch of Severian's life will lead to a better understanding of his relations with Chrysostom. Severian was a Syrian by birth.[4] Beyond this nothing more seems to be known of him till after he had become bishop of Gabala, a town on the coast of Syria, directly east of the Island of Cyprus. About the year 401, another bishop, a fellow countryman of Severian, Antiochus by name, returned from Constantinople after a residence of some time during which he had acquired no small repu-

[1] PG, 56, pp. 429–616.
[2] PG, 63, pp. 531–544; PG, 65, pp. 16–25.
[3] *Patrologie*, ed. 1910, p. 315.
[4] Socrates, *H.E.*, vi, 11; Sozomen, *H.E.*, viii, 10.

tation and fortune. Encouraged by his success, Severian determined to follow his example. He was kindly received by Chrysostom, who was perhaps deceived by his adulation and flattery, and soon gained a wide reputation, attracting the attention even of the Emperor.

About this time trouble arose in the church at Ephesus, and at the invitation of the bishop and the clergy Chrysostom journeyed to Ephesus to investigate the charges. Believing Severian to be his friend, he left him in charge of his church. Since there was much confusion and disagreement among the people of Ephesus over the choice of a successor, Chrysostom was detained for a considerable time. Meanwhile Severian continued to preach at Constantinople and to gain the favor of the people. Here the enmity between Chrysostom and Severian takes its rise. The cause seems rather insufficient. Socrates says that Serapion, Chrysostom's trusted deacon, who kept him constantly informed of the condition of affairs at home, reported that he was troubling the church. But this appears to be true only to the extent that he tried to please the people with his eloquence; perhaps, though it is not so stated, with an effort to win them away from Chrysostom. Serapion, who was apparently at no time over-fond of Severian, doubtless added color to the facts, and Chrysostom's natural irritability caused him to give the representation ready credence.

Further disagreement between Serapion and Severian arose soon after Chrysostom's return. One day, when Severian passed, the deacon refused to rise, as was the custom, in the presence of the bishop, but showed his contempt by retaining his seat. Severian is reported to have remarked, "If Serapion dies a Christian, Christ has not been incarnate," and this was so distorted as to represent him as having denied the incarnation of Christ. The matter was brought up before a synod. Serapion affirmed on oath that he had not seen Severian, and Chrysostom in so far

made a concession to Severian as to suspend the deacon from his duties for a week. Yet Severian was not satisfied. From that time Chrysostom would have nothing more to do with him, but advised him to return to his own city. As soon as the Empress heard of this, she recalled Severian and begged Chrysostom to be reconciled to him, placing her infant son, the future Emperor Theodosius, on his knees. To this entreaty Chrysostom finally yielded, though the reconciliation was only apparent.

About a year later, Severian was among those who urged the Emperor to summon a council against Chrysostom, as a result of which Chrysostom was exiled. The sympathies of the people were all with Chrysostom. The tumult which arose when they heard of their bishop's banishment was increased by a sermon which Severian preached in which he commended the sentence against Chrysostom and said that if he had been in no other respect guilty, he ought nevertheless to have been exiled on account of his pride.

This is all the historians tell of his life. For his eloquence and learning they have warm praise, though evidences of it are not very apparent in the sermons which have come down to us.

Although our knowledge of Severian's life is very scant and confined to two, or at most three years, yet it shows how closely he was connected with Chrysostom. His name was intimately associated with Chrysostom's in the minds of contemporaries. He preached in Chrysostom's church and his sermons were no doubt taken down by the same ecclesiastical stenographers who took down the sermons of Chrysostom.[1] Hence it is perhaps natural that his

[1] "How eloquent, convincing, and persuasive his sermons were, both those which were published by himself and such as were noted down by shorthand writers as he delivered them, why should we stay to declare?" (Socrates, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, vi, 4, in *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Second Series, N. Y., 1890; PG, 67, p. 672).

sermons should be included in the collections of the sermons of Chrysostom, and in time even become confused with them.

The majority of these have been recognized by editors as not sermons of Chrysostom and have accordingly been relegated to the *Spuria*. In order, therefore, to discover which of these sermons are to be credited to Severian, it will be necessary to examine first the known genuine sermons of Severian, and then the *Spuria* in the volumes of Chrysostom's sermons.

Among the authentic sermons of Severian there is one group of six, *De mundi creatione*. A study of these closely related sermons will accordingly be the best starting point and form the best foundation for a knowledge of Severian's style. The genuineness of these six sermons is guaranteed by Cosmas Indicopleustes, who lived about the middle of the sixth century, somewhat over a hundred years after Severian. He gives extended extracts from each of the sermons except the fifth.[1] A careful investigation of these sermons reveals certain characteristics of expression, style and learning. Most striking of these is a curious repetition of various expressions, some parenthetical, some hortatory, others resumptive, some consisting of a single word and others of several words. For convenience they may be divided into three classes: (1) those peculiar to Severian, seldom found in Chrysostom's sermons; (2) those common to Severian and Chrysostom, but particularly frequent in Severian; and (3) those common in Chrysostom but rare in Severian.

In group (1) are found such expressions as πρόσεχε, πρόσεχε παρακαλῶ, πρόσεχε ἀκριβῶς, πρόσεχε μετ' ἀκριβείας, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸ προκείμενον ἐπανέλθωμεν, ὡς ἔφθην εἰπών, ὅρα τὸ θαύμαστον or καὶ τὸ θαύμαστον, and perhaps ἵνα συντέμω.

In group (2) are the imperatives ἀκούε, ὅρα, and βλέπε,

[1] *Topographica Christiana*, Lib. x, PG 88, pp. 417–428.

and the second person singular indicative used interrogatively, εἶδες. While these in themselves, of course, are common enough in sermons, yet Severian is unusually fond of them. The same may be said of his use of ἀδελφοί, and possibly of οἷον or οἷόν τι λέγω.

Finally in group (3) are ἀγαπητέ and τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀγάπην, Chrysostom's equivalent of ἀδελφοί, of which the former occurs but once and the latter three times in these six sermons.

Of these groups the first is naturally the most important, as it contains Severian's characteristic expressions, which may be of great assistance in distinguishing his sermons from those of Chrysostom. This is especially true of his use of πρόσεχε. Generally it occurs absolutely; a bald, unadorned and unrhetorical exclamation, abruptly thrust between the sentences and wholly out of keeping with the manner of a "golden-mouthed" orator. It is our modern "Listen!" To be sure, the word itself is not unusual, but it is generally found in a sentence and with a dependent clause, with the dative or accusative and especially with τὸν νοῦν. Moreover, when it does occur absolutely in an address to a congregation, it is usually in the plural. Severian, however, invariably uses the singular. To him it has almost ceased to be a verb capable of inflection but has degenerated into a mere exclamation, sometimes to draw the attention of the people, sometimes merely as a filler while he is thinking of what he is going to say next. It has become a habit. And what is of chief interest is that it is a habit which does not appear to have affected other preachers of his time. Since, therefore, πρόσεχε is so peculiarly characteristic of Severian, it is an excellent mark of identification, and any sermon in the *Spuria* in which πρόσεχε occurs in this absolute usage is very likely Severian's, and must be examined for further points of resemblance.

So much at present for the expressions. As for the style, we should doubtless, encouraged by the references of the

historians to his eloquence and his rivalry with Chrysostom, expect considerable resemblance between the two. But such is by no means the case. Severian's sentences are short and abrupt, giving a very choppy and unfinished effect, quite in contrast with Chrysostom's even, smoothly-flowing, well-balanced sentences. His style is rough and inflexible. Montfaucon characterizes it as *strigosus, humilis et abiectus*. It is inelegant and barren, quite innocent of rhetorical devices. The only ones of which he makes any extended use are the rhetorical question, antithesis, and perhaps a form of anaphora. Page after page may be turned without coming upon any other figures. His arrangement of ideas is confused and without organization. He is not a clear thinker, but rambles along, saying whatever comes into his mind. Occasionally, when for a moment he is not sure what to say next, he inserts a πρόσεχε or perhaps, if he is particularly hard pressed for an idea, πρόσεχε ἀκριβῶς, παρακαλῶ. At first the reader sits up in expectation of something important but after several disappointments these exclamations lose all force.

His transitions are abrupt. At times he merely talks without saying anything, and then again he introduces something of greater value. Severian's ideas, however, are generally not of great importance. He is taken up with trifles and an investigation and explanation of things which have absolutely no value. For instance, when explaining "Bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh," he asks "How did Adam know he had bones?—he could not see them. The Holy Spirit must have revealed it to him." Then he staggers us with the profound and overwhelming question, But why did he mention bones before flesh? Because Eve was made from a rib.[1] Again he pauses to wonder where Christ got his garments after the resurrection. The former ones had been rent by the soldiers and the burial clothes were left in the tomb. Then he asks why the napkin was

[1] *De mundi creatione*, v, 8.

folded and set apart from the linen clothes. Why of course, he says, to prove that the disciples had not stolen the body, for they would not have stopped to fold them, but would have taken them along.[1] In another place he declares that the serpent was condemned "to go upon his belly" because the belly was the cause of the temptation and transgression.[2]

A little later he explains why God said, "I will increase thy grief and lamentation," when he meted out punishment to the transgressors in the garden. Because, says Severian, grief affects the eyes and lamentation the heart. These were accordingly punished, because the eye looked on the tree of knowledge, and the heart desired to be equal with God.[3]

These examples will suffice to show the general nature of Severian's exegesis. His originality and imagination, when they do assert themselves, frequently take this form.

Usually he devotes himself to useless comments, which continue on and on with little variety. The qualities which gave Chrysostom's sermons their powerful influence and wide appeal—"a power of exposition which unfolded in lucid order, passage by passage, the meaning of the book in hand; a rapid transition from clear exposition, or keen logical argument, to fervid exhortation, or pathetic appeal, or indignant denunciation; the versatile ease with which he could lay hold of any little incident of the moment, such as the lighting of the lamps in the church, and use it to illustrate his discourse; the mixture of plain common-sense, simple boldness, and tender affection, with which he would strike home to the hearts and consciences of his hearers"[4]—these are qualities which are rarely found in Severian.

In consideration of these facts of style and content it is difficult, from our modern point of view, to account for

[1] *De mundi creatione*, v, 9. [2] *De mundi creatione*, v, 8.
[3] *De mundi creatione*, vi, 9.
[4] W. R. Stephens, *Life of Saint Chrysostom*, p. 426.

the statements of Socrates and Sozomen which characterize Severian as an eloquent and learned man. Let us, however, not lose sight of the fact that it is the human voice which gives life to the dead words of a printed page. The sermon of a prominent preacher of to-day, when read in a book, may leave us unsatisfied and in doubt whether he really deserves the reputation he has made. But let us hear this same sermon delivered with all the power and force which the speaker's personality and natural magnetism can add, and the whole aspect of the sermon is changed. This natural magnetism Severian seems to have possessed. It must have been his manner of delivery, rather than the content of his sermons, which won him his reputation for eloquence and learning.

A more plausible reason for this reputation may be found in Severian's relation to the court. It was with the Empress Eudoxia and the court that he found favor, not with the people. For the people were always with Chrysostom. They arose in rebellion when he was taken away from them and on his return went forth to meet him and escort him to the church. When Severian tried to justify Chrysostom's banishment, the people became furious. When Chrysostom was reconciled to Severian, it was the Empress who pleaded the latter's cause. She regarded Severian as an eloquent preacher and so did the rest of the court. On what grounds? Surely, he could not compare with the greatest orator among the Christian Fathers. But Chrysostom was a man of sound Christian principles and positive convictions, who did not hesitate to denounce "spiritual wickedness in high places." Naturally he incurred the royal disfavor, while the people regarded him as their champion and defender. Severian's sermons, however, are simply expositions of Scripture with scarcely any moral application—merely a series of comments and observations. Whenever he did make any such application, it was of a

vague, indefinite nature, incapable of arousing any indignation or resentment—and likewise incapable of producing any beneficial results. Exhortation did not enter into Severian's sermons. He did not remind his hearers of their sins or of their duties left unfulfilled, nor did he urge them to mend their ways. Publicly to denounce some sin of the Empress, no matter how glaring, would not have entered the mind of Severian. Therefore it is not to be wondered at that the Empress regarded him with favor, for what royal court was ever willing to be reminded of its sins? Severian's reputation is due, not to any genuine oratorical ability or profundity of wisdom, but rather to an ingratiating manner and a smooth tongue.

It may seem strange, then, that later writers should have quoted Severian so frequently. But Severian was entirely orthodox in his Trinitarian views; as may be seen in several sermons in which he refutes the Arians. This would naturally lead to quotations by later writers, even though these quotations show no particular brilliance or individuality. Moreover his sermons—probably all the extant ones—were preached at the great see of Constantinople, where Chrysostom delivered his addresses, and no doubt this fact alone, not his learning or eloquence, won Severian considerable fame.

The other sermons regarded by Bardenhewer as genuine fall into two groups—those supported by quotations, and those ascribed to Severian on other grounds. To the first group belong the *De serpente,*[1] *In dictum illud Matth. 21:23,*[2] and *De sigillis librorum*[3]*;* to the second group, *In illud Abrahae dictum Gen. 24:2,*[4] *De ficu arefacta,*[5] *In Dei apparitionem,*[6] and *De pace.*[7]

[1] PG, 56, pp. 500–516. [2] PG, 56, pp. 411–428. [3] PG, 63, pp. 531–544.
[4] PG, 56, pp. 553–564. [5] PG, 59, pp. 585–590. [6] PG, 65, pp. 15–26.
[7] PG, 52, pp. 425–428. Only in Latin and fragmentary. For the Greek see A. Papadopolus-Kerameus, Ἀνάλεκτα ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς στοχυολογίας, St. Petersburg, 1891 ,I, pp. 15–26.

The *De serpente* is accepted as Severian's on the authority of John Damascene who wrote about the middle of the 8th century. Among other quotations he gives quite a long one from the *De serpente*, though not verbatim, naming the source as Σευηριάνου ἐπισκόπου Γαβάλων ἀπὸ λόγου τοῦ εἰς τὰ ἐγκαινία τοῦ Σωτῆρος.[1] It is also ascribed to Severian by the Synod of Paris about seventy-five years later.[2] The *Hom. in dictum illud Matth. 21:23* is ascribed to Chrysostum in Migne, but has been generally regarded as spurious. In support of this view are three quotations which ascribe it to Severian, one by Maximus Confessor (580–662)[3] and two by John Damascene.[4] While the quotation by Maximus Confessor may not be regarded as very trustworthy evidence, since he sometimes quotes spurious works, yet, as Haidacher[5] points out, in the case of a less famous author it may be regarded as trustworthy, especially when taken in connection with the other quotations. The third sermon, *De sigillis librorum*, is assigned to Chrysostom in a quotation by Pope Hadrian I,[6] but this is of small importance, since the sermon is attributed to Severian by a contemporary, Theodoretus of Cyrus (386–458).[7]

To the best of our knowledge, then, these three sermons and the six sermons *De mundi creatione* are certainly Severian's. Moreover, they all present the same peculiarities of style and expression. A detailed analysis, therefore, of one of these sermons will be the best means of illustrating Severian's characteristic peculiarities of style and thought,

[1] *De Imaginibus*, I, PG, 94, p. 1276.
[2] Mansi, *Collectio Conciliorum*, Paris and Leipzig (1901–1913), 14, p. 455.
[3] *Loci Communes*, PG, 91, p. 864.
[4] *Paralella Rupefucaldina*, PG, 96, pp. 480 and 533.
[5] *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, xxxii, 1908, pp. 410–413.
[6] PL, 96, p. 1227.
[7] *Eranistes*, III; PG, 83, p. 308. Theodoretus also gives another quotation from the *De sigillis librorum* in *Eranistes*, I; PG, 83, p. 80, again identifying it as Severian's.

and will form a basis for comparison with the other sermons. Perhaps the most suitable sermon for this purpose is the *De serpente*, because of the quotations by John Damascene and the Synod of Paris as well as the witness of tradition, and because it is one of the longest of his sermons and contains the greatest variety of illustrations.

The one outstanding peculiarity which appeared in the six sermons, *De mundi creatione*, was the repeated interjectional usage of πρόσεχε. This is likewise to be found in the *De serpente* in the form πρόσεχε ἀκριβῶς, which occurs three times. Besides this interjectional usage πρόσεχε also occurs in a sentence: πρόσεχε ἀκριβῶς, twice; προσέχωμεν ἀκριβῶς, once; and πρόσεχε once. These latter, however, are of little value as the word is fairly common in a sentence. πρόσεχε is peculiarly Severianic only in the absolute and exclamatory form.

One of Severian's failings as a speaker is his lack of order and arrangement. He talks on at random, frequently losing all sight of the subject with which he began. Sometimes, however, he catches himself in his wanderings and returns to the subject under investigation. In such cases he introduces another one of his formulas: ἀλλ' εἰς τὸ προκείμενον ἐπανέλθωμεν. This occurs four times in this sermon, once with the substitution of ἐπί for εἰς.

These two, then, are the peculiar phrases of Severian which appear in the *De serpente*. The second group of words as classified above[1] are those common to Severian and others, but particularly frequent in Severian. Among these is the use of ἀδελφοί or sometimes ἀδελφέ, which appears no less than fourteen times in the sixteen columns of this one sermon. While the word itself, of course, is very common in sermons, this frequent repetition of it is not so common and is therefore worthy of notice. And its value increases when we observe that Chrysostom very rarely

[1] P. 128.

uses ἀδελφοί. (In fact I have seen it only once in the sermons I have examined.) Instead he uses ἀγαπητοί or ἀγαπητέ or some such phrase as παραχαλῶ τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀγάπην. These are scarcely to be found in the nine sermons accepted above as genuine, ἀγαπητέ appearing once[1] and the latter phrase three times.[2] Accordingly, since ἀδελφοί is repeatedly used by Severian to the exclusion of ἀγαπητοί and ἀγαπητοί is used by Chrysostom to the exclusion of ἀδελφοί, the importance of the latter increases, at least as a factor in distinguishing the sermons of Severian from those of Chrysostom. And it is with sermons of Chrysostom that Severian's are most likely to have been confused.

Of less value, yet appearing so frequently as to attract almost immediate attention, are the imperatives ἀκούε, ὅρα and βλέπε. Again it must be admitted that these words are very common, even more so than ἀδελφοί, yet in this case again it is their repetition which makes them worthy of notice. Their value, however, lies rather in the confirmation which they give to previous evidence. We know that Severian is very fond of them, and if they appear repeatedly in a sermon which contains the earmarks of Severian's style, they accordingly help to establish the authorship, while their absence in such a case would not in itself condemn the sermon as spurious. In this sermon ἀκούε occurs eight times, ὅρα six times and βλέπε twice. The use of εἶδες and ὁρᾷς in rhetorical questions, of which the latter occurs four times, may also be mentioned in this same connection.

Perhaps of still less importance are οἷόν τι λέγω found three times in *De mundi creatione*, vi, and the linking of the aorist of φθάνω with the participle of εἶπον: ὡς ἔφθην εἰπών, "as I said before," which appeared in two of the sermons *De mundi creatione*. In this sermon the latter occurs in several

[1] *De mundi creatione*, iv, §. 10.
[2] *De mundi creatione*, i, §. 1; iv, §. 10; vi, §. 12.

forms, both in the singular and in the plural: ὡς ἔφθην εἰπών once; ὡς πολλάκις ἔφθην εἰπών, twice; ὡς ἔφθημεν εἰπόντες, once; ὥσπερ ἔφθημεν εἰπόντες, once. Since these variations, however, represent nothing but the introduction of πολλάκις, the substitution of ὥσπερ for ὡς and of the "editorial we" for the singular, they may all be classed as one form, thereby making five instances of the phrase in this sermon.

The third group of words, those common in Chrysostom but rare in Severian, includes only ἀγαπητοί and ἡ ὑμετέρα ἀγάπη and has already been noticed in connection with ἀδελφοί. Neither is found in this sermon.

Repetitions, in one form or another, are common in Severian. Not only does he repeat the words and phrases noted above, which appear constantly, but he also repeats occasional words, phrases, ideas, and Bible verses, sometimes to present a different explanation or point of view, and sometimes for emphasis. For instance in *De serpente* he repeats πῶς ἡ εἰκὼν τοῦ ἐπικαταράτου . . . to impress it upon his hearers:

> Have you not heard that which God spake, "Cursed art thou above every beast of the field"? How, then, could the image of that which was cursed bring life to our forefathers? I repeat the word that I may impress the thought upon you. If it seems impossible to you that a blessing should come from that which is cursed (for "Cursed is every one who hangeth on a tree"), how could the image of the serpent which was cursed, to which it was said, "Cursed art thou above every beast of the field," bring salvation to a people prostrate in adversity?

In §§ 1–2 he repeats ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὁ κρεμάμενος ἐπὶ ξύλον and in § 5 ἑόρταζ', Ἰούδα, τὰς ἑορτάς σου, ἀπόδος τῷ Θεῷ τὰς εὐχάς σου. οὐκέτι μὴ προσθῶσιν ἐλθεῖν πρὸς παλαίωσιν. Noteworthy is the fact that these repetitions very frequently occur three times, as is the case in both of these instances. Somewhat similar is the triple repetition in ἴδωμεν οὖν, ἴδωμεν, ἀδελφοί, ἴδωμεν,

παρακαλῶ (§ 7). Though there are some other minor instances of repetition, better examples may be found in other sermons of Severian.

The question of the repetitions in Severian is a curious one. Certain words and phrases attract his attention and are then repeated several times, perhaps unconsciously. In this sermon, three of the four instances of ἀλλ' εἰς τὸ προκείμενον ἐπανέλθωμεν occur within the space of one column. Again such a word as ἀδελφοί will not appear till at the very end of a sermon, and then there will be several instances in rapid succession. Does he easily fall into a rut? It would appear so from a study of his sermons.

Mention has been made of Severian's tendency to repeat a biblical verse three times. Similar to this, but more striking, are such triads of parallel construction as the following: ἐγείρω τὸν πεσόντα, ἀνακαινίζω τὸν φθαρέντα, ζωοποιῶ τὸν νεκρωθέντα (§ 5); Τριάδε προσκύνει, Τριάδα δόξαζε, Τριάδα κήρυττε. οὕτω φρονοῦσι προφῆται, οὕτω κηρύττουσιν ἀπόστολοι, οὕτω πιστεύουσι μάρτυρες (§ 6); (τῆς δὲ ἁγίας καὶ ἀθανάτου προσκυνητῆς Τριάδος τὴν φύσιν) οὐ τέμνει λόγος, οὐ μερίζει χρόνος, οὐ διιστῶσιν αἰῶνες (§ 7); ἀναγκαῖον γὰρ, ὄντως καὶ ἡμᾶς εἰπεῖν μετὰ σπουδῆς, καὶ ὑμᾶς ἀκοῦσαι μετὰ προθυμίας, καὶ ἐκείνους παιδευθῆναι μετὰ ἀληθείας (§ 7); ὃ ἐπίστευσας, ἀνεσκεύασας; ὃ ὡμολόγησας, ἀνέτρεψας; ὃ καθαρῶς διεσάφησας, τοῦτο πάλιν ἀσεβῶς ἐθόλωσας (§ 10).

In three of the six sermons *De mundi creatione* Severian makes an apology for his treatment of the subject, saying that he cannot do it justice, but that he has done or will do his best: περὶ ὧν κατὰ δύναμιν, εἰ καὶ μὴ κατ' ἀξίαν διελάβομεν πρώην (iv., § 1); οὐ κατ' ἀξίαν τοῦ πράγματος, ἀλλὰ κατὰ δύναμιν τὴν ἡμετέραν (v., § 1); εἰ καὶ μὴ κατ' ἀξίαν, ἀλλ' οὖν γε ὅσον κατὰ δύναμιν ἡμετέραν (vi., § 1). In the *De serpente* it takes the form οὐχ ἵνα τῆς ἀξίας ἐφικώμεθα, ἀλλ' ἵνα τὴν κατὰ δύναμιν ὀφειλὴν ἀποτίσωμεν (§ 1).

The general characteristics of Severian's style have been noted above. Montfaucon, commenting upon the *De serpente*, says that it undoubtedly belongs to Severian, a man not without eloquence, but whose eloquence, in the

words of Savilius, might be termed *ferrea;* that he is not lacking in originality and imagination but that his originality is very frequently worthless. The diction, he says, is not elegant; in fact the style resembles that of the six sermons *De mundi creatione* very closely. This is indeed the case. The short sentences, which are found in those sermons, frequently interspersed with short biblical quotations, are not wanting in the *De serpente.* Such a passage as ἐγείρω τὸν πεσόντα . . . τῶν οὐρανίων (§ 5) may serve as an illustration. When the verb in a series of such short sentences is some form of εἰμί, Severian is very likely to omit it: οὐδὲν τοίνυν μεταξὺ Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. οὐδεὶς χρόνος ἢ διάστημα χρόνου. πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα (§ 7); Κύριος τοίνυν ὁ Πατήρ, ὁ Υἱὸς Κύριος, Κύριος τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. Ἀλλ' ὁ Παῦλος λέγει, Εἷς Κύριος. [εἰ] εἷς Κύριος, πῶς Κύριος καὶ Κύριος; δηλονότι μία ἡ κυριότης. οὕτω καὶ εἷς Θεὸς, φησὶν ὁ Παῦλος (§ 8). The great fondness which Severian shows for the rhetorical question need be only mentioned, as illustrations may be found on every page. The other rhetorical figure which he uses to any extent is antithesis, of which several instances occur in this sermon: ὅπου Θεὸς, ἐκεῖ ἀρετῆς ἀνάβασις· ὅπου κακία, ἐκεῖ παρανομίας κατάβασις (§ 1); ἐσταυρώθη, φησὶν, ὄφις, ἵνα καταργηθῇ τῶν δρακόντων τὰ δήγματα· ἐσταυρώθη Χριστὸς, ἵνα καταργηθῶσιν τῶν δαιμόνων αἱ ἐνέργειαι. ἄλλος ὁ ὄφις ὁ πηγνύμενος, καὶ ἄλλοι οἱ καταργούμενοι δράκοντες· ἄλλος ὁ ἐπὶ σταυροῦ Χριστὸς, καὶ ἄλλοι οἱ καταργούμενοι δαίμονες (§ 3); ἐνταῦθα, ἀδελφοὶ, οὐ κύματα θαλάσσης ἐστὶν, ἵνα συμπνίξῃ, ἀλλ' ἀγάπης κύματα, ἵνα ἁγιάσῃ (§ 8); ἡμῖν τὰ δῶρα παρὰ τῆς χάριτος· καὶ παρ' ὑμῶν ἡ βλασφημία τῇ χάριτι; παρὰ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἡμῖν ἐλευθερία· καὶ παρ' ὑμῶν δουλεία τῷ Πνεύματι (§ 10). Thus the balanced sentence does appear at times. A better instance is the following: ὑμνοῦμεν τὸν Θεὸν, οὐ τιμὴν αὐτῷ περιτιθέντες, ἀλλὰ τιμὴν ἑαυτοῖς περιποιούμενοι. δοξάζομεν τὸν Θεὸν, οὐκ ἐκείνῳ δόξαν χαριζόμενοι, ἀλλ' ἑαυτοὺς τὴν ἀθάνατον δόξαν ἐνδύοντες (§ 1). However, such sentences are rather exceptional and only emphasize the general barrenness of his style.

In the *De serpente* Severian to a certain extent outdoes

himself. His sermons usually consist of a series of speculative comments and observations. This appears clearly in the *De mundi creatione*. Sometimes this takes the form of imaginary thought-processes on the part of God or the devil, or a conversation between God and Adam to fill out the Bible narrative, and sometimes it is a mere multiplication of words which have no value for the interpretation of the text or the instruction of the people. An illustration of this is not difficult to find: καὶ ὅρα τὸ θαυμαστὸν . . . ὁ Θεὸς ἐδόξασεν: *De mundi creatione*, v, § 7.

However the *De serpente* represents a certain improvement as a considerable portion of the sermon is devoted to a refutation of the Arians and so naturally calls forth such powers of argument and ability for genuine exegesis as he did possess. In § 4, for instance, he takes up the Arian argument that Christ is inferior because He was sent by the Father (John 17:3), and shows that this refers to the incarnation and not to an actual sending from one place to another. For how, asks Severian, could the Father, who is admitted even by the Arians to be omnipresent, send anyone from the place where He is to some other place? There is no other place. Hence He sent Christ, not from one place to another, but from an invisible divinity to a visible Advent. Yet such passages are rare.

These, then, are the various elements which may be looked for in a sermon of Severian. Any one of them taken alone is, of course, an insufficient reason for attributing a sermon to him, though the absence of πρόσεχε in the absolute form and in the singular,[1] or the presence of ἀγαπητοί is sufficient to make a sermon appear doubtful at first glance. However, when a great majority of these characteristics are found in one sermon, they form a trait sufficiently individual and distinctive to make it seem quite certainly Severian's.

[1] Severian uses the plural only in the first person of the subjunctive.

The importance of the characteristic phrases and of the repetition of the more common words may be further illustrated by a comparison with corresponding words and phrases in some of the sermons of Chrysostom.[1] Thus, for instance, the following four quotations resemble Severian's: πρόσεχε, παρακαλῶ, or πρόσεχε μετ' ἀκριβείας, yet they are not as abrupt, nor are they fixed formulas: διανάσητε τοίνυν, καὶ μετὰ ἀκριβείας προσέχετε τοῖς ρηθήσεσθαι μέλλουσιν (49, p. 37); ὑμᾶς παρακαλῶ μετὰ ἀκριβείας εἰδέναι (49, p. 37); σπουδάσωμεν τὰ εἰρημένα μετ' ἀκριβείας κατασχεῖν (49, p. 109); ἀλλὰ διανάσητε καὶ προσέχετε μετ' ἀκριβείας ἡμῖν (49, p. 113). Again, instead of the emphatic ἀλλ' ἐπίδοτέ μοι τὴν ψυχὴν τὴν ὑμετέραν, ἐπίδοτέ μοι τὴν ἀκοὴν μικρόν· ἀποτινάξασθε τὴν ἀθυμίαν (49, p. 37), Severian would no doubt have used the same trite formula, emphasizing it perhaps by a louder tone of voice rather than by any variation in wording. From these comparisons it appears that, in contrast to Severian, Chrysostom (1) uses προσέχω in the plural, (2) is not confined to προσέχω but also uses other words, (3) presents great variety in the form of his exhortations for attention, (4) does not use προσέχω as an abrupt exclamation.

Severian's resumptive ἀλλ' εἰς τὸ προκείμενον ἐπανέλθωμεν does not occur in these fifteen sermons of Chrysostom. However, Chrysostom has similar expressions, as καὶ ἐπὶ την ἀρχὴν πάλιν ἐπανέλθωμεν and ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκολούθιαν ἐπανέλθωμεν while in Sermo XIV it occurs in the form which Severian continually uses: ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸ προκείμενον ἐπανέλθωμεν. Yet each one differs from the other and Chrysostom is not confined to a single form.

As for the class of single words commonly used, the contrast between Chrysostom's ἀγαπητοί (ἀγαπητέ) and Severian's ἀδελφοί, as well as a distinction in regard to the frequency

[1] Homilies on the Statues, i–x, PG, 49, pp. 15–120.
Homilies on 1 Corinthians, i–v, PG, 61, pp. 11–48.
The numbers in parentheses in the following pages refer to the volume and page of the PG.

of their usage, is clearly brought out in this comparison. ἀδελφοί appears in the one sermon *De serpente* no less than fourteen times (twice in the singular), whereas ἀγαπητοί is found in these fifteen sermons but seventeen times (seven times in the singular)—an average of about once in each sermon. In fifteen sermons of Severian,[1] on the other hand, ἀδελφοί appears no less than seventy-eight times,—an average of about five times in each sermon.

Chrysostom has also another word which he sometimes substitutes for ἀγαπητέ, namely ἄνθρωπε. This occurs eleven times.

The imperatives found so frequently in Severian are scarcely to be found in these sermons; ὅρα six times, ἀκούε twice (ἄκουσον occasionally), βλέπε once. The interrogatives εἶδες and ὁρᾷς however, are quite numerous, the former appearing fourteen times and the latter twenty-three times. οἷόν τι λέγω is found four times and ὥσπερ ἔφθην εἰπών twice (ὅπερ twice).

Another phrase—ἵνα συντέμω—which did not appear in the *De serpente* but which is occasionally found in other sermons of Severian, finds no counterpart in these sermons of Chrysostom except ἵνα μηδὲν εἴπω πλέον (49, p. 114). ὅρα (or καὶ) τὸ θαυμαστόν, which Severian uses at times, is amplified when used by Chrysostom: καὶ τὸ δὴ θαυμαστὸν καὶ παράδοξον (49, p. 63), τὸ δὲ μέγιστον καὶ παράδοξον (49, p. 65).

The rhetorical question affords another point of contrast. Severian generally introduces it with διὰ τί, whereas Chrysostom is very fond of τίνος ἕνεκεν. It is missing in only four of these fifteen sermons while διὰ τί is found in but one. He commonly uses the correlative διὰ τοῦτο, but the question is usually asked by τίνος ἕνεκεν.

A characteristic phrase of Chrysostom, as compared with Severian at least, is the parenthetical εἰπέ μοι which appears

[1] These fifteen include several sermons not in Bardenhewer's list but which appear from internal evidence to be Severian's.

in most of the sermons, but does not occur in Severian. Again, Chrysostom at times repeats the first word of a sentence when followed by γάρ by way of emphasizing it: οἶδα γάρ, οἶδα, or οὐ γάρ ἐστιν, οὐκ ἔστιν (63, p. 17).

On the basis of these comparisons, then, we may add the weight of internal evidence to the external evidence which assigns the two sermons *In dictum illud Matth. 21:23* and *De sigillis librorum* to Severian. For both of them present the same peculiarities of expression and the same general barrenness of style and subject matter.

Four more of the sermons ascribed to Severian by Bardenhewer still await consideration. Though external evidence is lacking, Dupin believes that the homily *In illud Abrahae dictum, Gen. 24:2* is Severian's. The style certainly bears a close resemblance in its short sentences, rhetorical questions, and characteristic phrases. The course of argument, moreover, is confused and even obscured—quite in keeping with the ramblings of Severian.

The homily *In Dei apparitionem* may likewise be regarded as Severian's with no small degree of certainty, if for no other reason than that it contains all the marks which go to make up his style of sermon.

In the homily *De pace* we find a case of a different kind. As the footnote in the Greek edition by Papadopulos-Kerameus points out, the sermon is ascribed to no one in the manuscript from which it is taken. Yet from its general makeup, from its connection with Chrysostom's sermon on the same occasion, and from the title to the fragment of the Latin text which has been preserved,[1] it seems safe to regard it as Severian's. At first sight the absence of Severian's favorite expressions, ἀδελφοί and πρόσεχε, may awaken suspicion. But we soon realize that this sermon is different from his others. It is a eulogy on peace, and had

[1] *Sermo Severiani de pace, cum susceptus esset a beato Joanne episcopo Constantinopolitano.*

been carefully prepared for the occasion,[1] for it could not have been a sincere expression of the heart, as subsequent events proved. Accordingly, the interjections of extemporaneous speech are wanting, for he has clearly in mind just what he is going to say. Since, therefore, this contradiction is only apparent, and there is nothing further to disprove his authorship, we may quite safely accept the evidence which ascribes it to Severian.

On the contrary, the homily *De ficu arefacta*, although regarded by Bardenhewer as Severian's, and ascribed to him by J. B. Aucher,[2] is quite certainly not his. It indeed resembles Severian's style in its short sentences interspersed with biblical quotations and in its lack of polish. However, Severian's favorite phrases are entirely missing. Instead of ἀδελφοί we find ἀγαπητοί eight times. In all the other authentic sermons of Severian this word has occurred but once (*De mundi creatione*, iv). Moreover πρόσεχε, which has not been missing in one of these sermons, is not to be found at all. One phrase only comes near to Severian: ἀλλ' ἐπανέλθωμεν ἐπὶ τὸ κεφάλαιον. But Severian invariably uses προκείμενον, not κεφάλαιον, and always places the verb at the end. Accordingly with so little in its favor, these important differences are quite sufficient to brand it as spurious.

Among the thirteen sermons, therefore, named by Bardenhewer, the *De ficu arefacta* alone must be rejected, leaving the other twelve as genuine.

From this group we may form a fair estimate of the general nature of Severian's sermons, aside from the characteristic expressions. His sermons seldom treat less than three different Bible selections or topics, following no particular τάξις, which he praises so highly in the Bible and

[1] This occasion was the temporary reconciliation between Chrysostom and Severian, effected through the intervention of the Empress Eudoxia on Severian's behalf.

[2] Severiani . . . Gabalorum episc. . . . homiliae . . . Venice, 1827.

God's creation, but passing quite abruptly from one subject to another. His usual method is to quote a few words or a sentence and then comment briefly on them, frequently repeating the same quotation twice[1] with additional remarks. His comments on these passages are generally quite short, and he soon passes on to some other subject.

There is no way of dating the sermons from their contents, as he never makes any reference to contemporary events of any kind, unless possibly it be in the homily *De pace.* The nearest he comes to bringing his sermons to bear on everyday life is a very occasional "as is the case to-day," but such references are only to generalities, never to specific events. His sermons are devoted entirely to biblical interpretation, with an occasional reply to heretics. He is very fond of pointing out the purpose of some word or action in Scripture: this or that was done ἵνα μάθῃς or ἵνα δείξῃ. He is also fond of filling out a Bible narrative by representing some incorporeal being as speaking or by putting into words the thought-processes which might lead up to a certain action.

With the establishment of this group and the knowledge it affords of the peculiarities which appear consistently in each and every one of the sermons, we are prepared to assign to Severian the sermon *Contra Judaeos* PG, 61, pp. 793 ff., and the following five sermons in the *Spuria* of PG, 59, pp. 599, 627, 653, 663, 687. In each of these the characteristics of Severian's style are prominent.

[1] Thus making a triple repetition. See p. 138.

Luther and Culture

By

John Alfred Faulkner

LUTHER AND CULTURE

By John Alfred Faulkner, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Church History in Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.

(*Read December 29, 1919*)

IT is the aim of the present paper to state Luther's attitude or relation to intellectual, literary, or other matters which we generally associate with the word culture. This is all the more interesting from the fact that on this side Luther and his Reformation have received some hard knocks. The familiar complaint of Erasmus that the Lutheran cause meant the decay of letters comes to us. Moderns have repeated it. Von Döllinger says that Luther showed an inimical feeling toward the liberal sciences, and influenced destructively the scientific spirit and development of Germany.[1] Janssen takes the same view.[2] Paulsen echoes them, and thinks universities and schools nearly went under in the churchly conflict.[3] H. Schiller joins them in looking on the Reformation as a movement which was an enemy to culture.[4] On the other hand Gundert praises Luther as a herald whose true and powerful watchman's voice called into life a new education and learning in Germany which went far beyond the evangelical lands.[5] It will be

[1] *Die Reformation* i, p. 442 (1848–51).

[2] *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes*, ii, p. 293 ff.; iv, p. 86 ff.

[3] *Geschichte des gelehrten Unterrichts, u. s. w.* (1885), pp. 128 ff., 132 f., 139 ff.

[4] *Lehrbuch der Pädagokik*, 1891, p. 92.

[5] In K. A. Schmid, *Geschichte der Erziehung* (1884), ii, pt 2, p. 202. I am indebted to Zweynert for these references.

interesting then to look for ourselves into Luther's real relations in this intellectual field.

Was there anything in Luther's fundamental views which would naturally lead him to obscurantism? I do not find so. Harnack says that Luther had two determinative thoughts, not that he had systematically thought them through but acted upon them in living conviction. The one was that the Christian faith was bound exclusively to God and to the Person of Christ, and that therefore not the letter of Scripture obligated, but the Gospel which it contained. The other was that all self-elected forms of piety were evil, that therefore the verification or test of religion must follow in the great ordinances of human life, marriage, family, state, and calling. Religion is not grounded on a doing or a knowing, but on a "gläubige Gesinnung," a believing temper or conviction: this is the true worship, a rugged confidence in God, and the assurance that he is served in love to one's neighbor. The effects were immeasurable, for with one stroke religion was freed from everything foreign to it, and at the same time the independent right of the natural life, and therefore of science, was acknowledged. This meant also the freeing of religion from philosophy and from a theology inconsistent with the Gospel. There also struggled through to independence everything that had a right to free validity. Before him none had separated so clearly the great territories of life. The State is no longer a fatal structure from necessity forced on the Church, but a sovereign order of public common life; law not an undefinable middle thing between the might of the stronger and the virtue of the Christian, but the independent norm of social intercourse protected by authority; marriage not a kind of churchly concession to the weak, but the divinely willed free union of the sexes free from every churchly tutelage; charity and care of the poor not a working for insurance of one's own salvation, but the free service of one's neighbor which finds in real helpful-

ness its last object and its single reward; over all, the civic calling, simple activity in house and court, in business and office, no longer mistrustfully judged as withdrawing from heaven, but the right spiritual estate, the sphere in which disposition and character are to be tested. Luther not only began the freeing of the knowledge of truth from the dominance of tradition and thus made possible a pure consideration of history, but also proclaimed the freedom and responsibility of the worker. To the scientific worker he has given a certainty of his God, of his personal worth, and therewith breathed in an indestructible idealism. Thus Harnack.[1]

It does not appear that there was anything in these ideas unfavorable to the advancement of science and education; on the contrary they ought logically to have stimulated both. Of course Luther's high doctrine of the Bible, or rather his method of interpretation, made him hostile to the Copernican astronomy, and we have his oft-quoted Table Talk about the "new astronomer who wished to prove that the earth moved." But he did not go as far as he might. He claimed that astronomy was a perfectly legitimate science, had his own theories about the movement of the heavenly bodies, and also had a theory of comets. He distinguished between a real science and a false one like astrology. "I praise astronomy and mathematics, which have to do with demonstrations, and I think that any star is greater than the earth, and that the sun is by far the greatest of the stars. For astrology I have no respect." "No one will persuade me to believe in the predictions of astrology." When told that physicians predict, he replied: "Physicians have certain symptoms and experiences to guide them, and often hit the truth, but astrologers very frequently fail."

[1] Harnack, *Martin Luther in seiner Bedeutung für die Geschichte der Wissenschaft und der Bildung* (delivered 1883), *in Reden und Aufsätze*, 1904, pp. 160–4 (abridged).

Some one put to him the very question as to what should be done when there is an apparent contradiction between science and the Bible. "Which should we believe," they asked, "the authority of Scripture or the demonstrations of astronomy?" Luther's reply smacks of the 19th century, making the point that the sacred writers speak by accommodation to appearances. He says:

> From the theory of eclipses which is supported by accurate demonstrations, we are convinced that astronomical theories ought not to be rejected. I believe, therefore, that Moses spoke according to our power of comprehension, describing the moon as it seems to us; as Vergil speaks of a blazing star, according to the impression it makes upon the ordinary person. For the Scriptures often give proof of our infirmity.

He praises the "human understanding for having observed with so great accuracy the orbits of the planets. . . . Afterwards came the soothsayer which spoiled astronomy."[1] Luther therefore was much more modern than the utterance on the Copernican matter might lead us to suppose. Even a man so steeped in classical learning as Melanchthon, who certainly had the soul of a scholar and kept up his friendship with Erasmus to the last, was far behind Luther as to astrology as well as in the freshness and independence of his point of view.

Luther was concerned for universities. As early as 1517–18, he joined with Melanchthon and Spalatin in a sketch for the reforming of university studies.[2] In 1524 he and Melanchthon furnished for the Elector a form of a university, which the latter did not indorse. He changed it

[1] Preserved Smith and Gallinger, *Conversations with Luther*, 1915, p. 101 ff. No references to originals, some of which can be found, however, in *Luther's Tischreden*, ed. Förstemann and Bindseil, iv, 573 ff. (later referred to in this paper as *Tischr.*).

[2] De Wette, *Luthers Briefe*, i, p. 97.

on Spalatin's suggestions, and it was accepted. He was concerned that in Wittenberg the "silly lectures on Peter of Spain, Tartaretus, the useless lectures on Thomas and Scotus, as they only trouble excellent people, should be mostly put to one side, and step by step let biblical and philological lessons be substituted." Through his influence Aristotle and the *Sentences* almost lost their vogue in the university, and biblical theology took their place. From 1518 the Wittenberg students devoted themselves to Bible studies with glowing zeal, and crowded the Greek and Hebrew lecture rooms. On March 27, 1519, Luther wrote to Frederick the Wise: "Greek and Hebrew are studied with joy at your Wittenberg. The free arts are taught with greater skill than hitherto; the pure theology of Christ triumphs over the almost meaningless opinions and questions of men."[1] In an address to Melanchthon's students of theology he congratulates them that studies (*literas*), especially those which pertain to piety, have gone forward remarkably in a short time, in fact are born again. In a letter to Margrave George of Brandenburg, July 18, 1529, he counsels him thus—

It would be good if in your Grace's principality your Grace were to establish one or two Universities, where not only the Holy Scripture but law and all the sciences would be taught. From the schools learned men could be gotten as preachers, pastors, secretaries, councillors, etc., for the whole principality. To this purpose the income of the monasteries and foundations might be applied so that scholars could be maintained in the schools at proper salaries, viz., two theologians, two jurists, one professor of medicine, one mathematician, and for grammar, logic, rhetoric, four or five men. For study-deserted monasteries are not good, but a (University) city, in which many people come together, practice on one another, stir each other up, and drive each other on, which solitary studies do not ac-

[1] *Ibid.*, i, p. 242.

complish. It is well also that in all towns and villages good primary schools should be established out of which could be picked and chosen those who were fit for the Universities, and those who can serve your land and people. If scholars trained in these schools hold office under other princes, this does no harm, for these men will promote the founding and endowment of schools in the lands of other princes and people.[1]

Luther had no patience with short-sighted people who begrudged their sons the long years of university training because these years could be financially more profitable. How fatal! The merchant will not long be a merchant, (he says) where preaching and law fail. We theologians and jurists must remain or everything goes under. Where theologians depart, there departs also God's Word, and mere heathen and mere devils remain; where the jurists go, there go right and law as well as peace, and what remains is just robbery, murder, crime, force, in fact simple wild cattle. For what the merchant gains where peace has gone, I shall let his ledger declare; and what is the good of all his gains where preaching fails, that let his conscience attest.[2] (Thanks to our universities) we have the finest and most learned young fellows and men, adorned with languages, ever learning, who are so very useful where they are needed to teach the young. Have you not seen with your eyes that a boy can now be brought farther in three years, knows more in his fifteenth or eighteenth year than hitherto all high schools and monasteries could do?[3] . . . Here I shall relate how many learned men we must have in medicine and other free sciences, on which one might write a big book and preach for half a year. Whence will preachers and

[1] *Luther's Correspondence*, ed. Smith and Jacobs, ii, pp. 487–8; De Wette, iii, p. 486.

[2] Sermon, *dass man die kinder zur Schule halten solle*, in Erl. Ausg., 20, (1st ed.), p. 39. *Cf.* the transl. of Painter, *Luther on Education*, 1889, p. 262.

[3] Text in *Luther als Erzieher*, 1902, p. 100; *cf.* Painter, p. 236.

jurists and physicians arise, where grammatical and other arts are not at hand? In short I say this: a diligent pious schoolmaster or Master (of Arts) or whoever he is who truly instructs and teaches boys,—him we can never sufficiently praise nor sufficiently pay, as even the heathen Aristotle says.[1]

What would Luther have taught in the universities? What was his idea of studies? He thought highly of language study, wrote Latin with force, though not with the elegance and ease of Erasmus, knew Greek and Hebrew, and was insistent on going back to the originals. In studying languages it was necessary to study things as well as words, to listen to preachers and market people as well as to study books. Grammar must go hand in hand with knowledge of things and deeds. "The Hebrew language is best and richest in words, and pure, having its own color; Greek, Latin and German borrow, having many composita," and he goes on with interesting points as to Hebrew.[2]

Without Hebrew no one can understand Holy Scripture. As for the New Testament it is written in Greek, though it is full of Hebraisms. Therefore it is rightly said that the Hebrews drink out of the fountain, the Greeks out of the flowing water, the Latin out of the pond. I am no Hebraist according to grammar and rules.[3]

Luther claimed that to be an interpreter required more than mere knowledge, it needed a special gift of God.

Greek is rich in good and charming words, proper distinct words, friendly and gracious. It is richer in letters than the Latin and has points of contact with German.[4]

According to Luther the spread of Greek and Latin was a

[1] Erl. Ausg. 20, p. 39–40 (1st ed.), *Cf.* Painter, p. 263–4.
[2] *Tischr.* iv, p. 568–9. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 570.
[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 568, 572, 573, 674. Luther's remarks on the different languages are very interesting, whether all well taken or not.

preparation for the Gospel, "that it might speedily bear fruit far and wide." He thought the revival of Greek in his own time was equally providential.

> For a time no one understood why God had revived the study of the languages; but now we see that it is for the sake of the Gospel, which he wished to bring to light and thereby destroy the reign of Antichrist. For the same reason he gave Greece a prey to the Turks, in order that Greek scholars driven from home and scattered abroad might bear the Greek tongue to other countries, and thereby excite an interest in the study of languages.[1]

He claimed that in the measure in which the Gospel is dear to us we ought to cherish the languages. They are essential to it, the "casket in which this jewel is enshrined." Knowledge of one reacts on the other. In schools and monasteries where the Gospel has been perverted, Latin and German have been corrupted. The loss of Greek was the loss of the Gospel, thought Luther.

> Since the languages disappeared not much that is excellent has been seen in the Church, but through the ignorance of the languages many shocking abominations have arisen. On the other hand, since the revival of learning such a light has been shed abroad, and such important things have taken place that the world is astonished, and must acknowledge that we have the Gospel almost as pure and unadultered as it was in the times of the apostles and much purer than in the days of St. Jerome and St. Augustine.[2]

Since the Holy Spirit has restored the tongues, it is our duty to cultivate them. If Augustine and Hilary had known Greek and Hebrew, how much more reliable their interpretations would have been. Just so with St. Bernard, "a man of great ability, so that I am inclined to place him

[1] Erl. Ausg., 22, p. 182 (1st ed.). [2] *Ibid.*, 22, p. 183–4.

above all other distinguished teachers whether ancient or modern; but how often he trifles with the Scriptures (through his ignorance of the original languages), in a spiritual manner to be sure, perverts them from their true meaning."[1] Nor will the Spirit take the place of the knowledge of languages. There is no assured and thorough handling of the Scriptures, nor usefulness to other nations, without a knowledge of the original tongues.[2] In fact Luther claims that his own work as a reformer rested under God on his knowledge of languages.

I know full well that the Spirit does almost everything. Still I should have failed in my work if the languages had not come to my aid, and made me strong and immovable in the Scriptures. I might without them have been pious and preached the Gospel in obscurity, but I could not have disturbed the pope.[3] The devil is not afraid of piety (denn mein geist nimpt ihm nichts); it is the Scriptures and the languages which drive him from the world and break up his kingdom.

Let me give two other quotations of great interest here:

I know well that whoever shall preach and explain the Scriptures and has not the help of Latin, Greek and Hebrew, but does it from his mother-tongue alone, will fall into many errors. For I know by experience how these languages help much to the understanding of Divine Scripture. St. Augustine felt also that one should know Greek and Hebrew before he taught the Word in the Church, for the Holy Spirit wrote the Old and New Testaments in these languages.[4]

It is true that half-educated people are the most useless in the world, and it would be better if they knew nothing at all. For they obey nobody, think they know everything better than all the world, and can judge all art and Scripture, while they can

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 186.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 188.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 188.
[4] Walch Ausg., 19, p. 1629.

really teach nobody anything correctly, and allow themselves to be taught by nobody.[1]

It is evident, then, that Luther would have had no sympathy with the present low estate of Hebrew in the theological seminaries and of Greek in the colleges. The study of both was absolutely indispensable. Nor would he have had more sympathy with the obscurantist crusade against non-English languages in America.

I do not hold with those who give themselves to one language, and despise all others. For I should like to educate such people as can be of use to Christ in foreign lands, that it may not go with us as with the Waldenses in Bohemia, who confined their doctrine to their own language in such a way that no one could clearly understand them without first learning their language. But the Holy Spirit acted differently. He did not wait till all the world came to Jerusalem and learned Hebrew, but he bestowed the gift of tongues upon the Apostles, so that they could speak wherever they came. I prefer to follow his example, and hold it proper to exercise the young in many languages. For who knows how God may use them? For this purpose also schools are established.[2]

As to the study of the literatures in these ancient tongues, while of course the Bible was the chief, the Greek and Latin classics had their place. They suffer indeed from a fatal defect, as they teach nothing of faith, hope, love, but only of the present. Trust in God and confidence in the Lord —there is nothing of that in them. They speak according to the reason and draw only from natural knowledge,— beautiful words but no sure knowledge of salvation. They write about immortality, but have no earnest faith in it. The classics are indeed "great, fine and useful books," but have no comparison with Holy Scripture, which deserves another treatment entirely than as a comedy of Terence or a

[1] *Ibid.*, 5, p. 1652. [2] Walch Ausg., 10, p. 270.

saying of Vergil. The boundless eloquence (*immensa facundia*) of Homer has made immortal a slight matter before Troy in a book which is the source, yes, the ocean of learning, wisdom and eloquence. Lucian is a most attractive satirist, in a clear taking form, though he draws the holiest things of mankind in the dust. Æsop's fables are invention, as no such man ever lived; clever writers made them piece by piece, and finally they were brought into order by some scholar. But as to contents they are priceless, and outside of Cato's little book it is the best book of antiquity on the secular life. Besides its good teaching on morality, discipline, experience and the practical life, its form is very attractive to the young. (Luther published a translation of Æsop in 1539.)

Luther was much impressed by the masterly eloquence of Cicero. To read him is fascinating. He draws one on, and he sinks into the heart. He both instructs and shows us eloquence, and thus combines the practical and the real. Livy is a notable historian, but not perfect, as he lacks precision and impartiality. The elder Pliny was an excellent spirit, but a clever fool to stumble at the Christian thought of resurrection and to mock it as miserable folly. It was hateful in him to complain of nature as though she were a stepmother and not rather the feeder of mankind, and also to assert with Aristotle the eternity of the world. He denied the being of God and affirmed fate, and so one Pauline lecture is more valuable than many on Pliny. The poets are looked on by Luther too seriously with religious eyes. They are too much inclined to lie. They make a thing big, and throw it up to you high. Like a good painter they paint a person much more handsome than she is. Still Luther prefers a leaf from Terence to all the Dialogues and Colloquies of Erasmus,[1] which is certainly a prejudiced

[1] Cordatus, *Tagebuch über Luther*, hsg. Wrampelmeyer, (1885), p. 356, No. 1338.

judgment, and the Metamorphoses of Ovid to the philosophy of Duns and Thomas.[1] Vergil excels the rest in glory and valor, everything in him is masterly and weighty, his hero is a model still.[2] Whoever wrote the Æneid, was an excellent theologian.[3] Ovid is also a beautiful poet.[4] Lascivious poets must be entirely thrown out of school.[5]

Dialetics is a necessary art, which one should carefully study, just as he does arithmetic and reckoning. While it does not teach us of things, it shows us finely the way we should speak of things, how we should properly understand and judge them. It shows us how concisely and properly to define and describe.

While dialectic teaches and belongs to the understanding, rhetoric moves and belongs to the will. Elocution is not a made-up painted garnish of words, but a fine adorned address which sets forth a subject skilfully, clearly, and with distinction, as in a beautiful painting. As to how to proceed under dialectics and rhetoric Luther says: 1. Distinguish what it properly means. 2. Define, describe and point out what it is. 3. If you are a preacher bring out the sayings of the Scripture in your thesis, and therewith prove and strengthen it. 4. Point and illuminate it with examples. 5. Adorn it with similes or parables. 6. Exhort and make sprightly and vigorous. Luther thought very highly of both dialectics and rhetoric, "indispensable in schools, consistories, courts of justice and churches," and he often emphasized their importance for the preacher. He was far from wishing, he said, that poetry and rhetoric should be omitted from the instruction of youth, as by these studies men are made skilful to get hold of religious things and to treat them in the right happy way.[6]

History was a new discipline of Humanism. In his

[1] De Wette, i, p. 190; vi, p. 14.
[2] *Tischr.*, iv, p. 599.
[3] *Ibid.*, iv, p. 406.
[4] *Ibid.*, iv, p. 599.
[5] *Ibid.*, iv, p. 600.
[6] See *Tischreden*, iv, pp. 305, 424, 555–6, 559.

inaugural at Wittenberg Melanchthon urged its study, and Luther thought highly of it. He regrets that so many histories have perished and great deeds are unrecorded. In his *Vorrede zu Galeatii Capellae Historia vom Herzog zu Mailand*, 1538, he says:

The celebrated Roman Varro says that the very best way to teach is when example is added to the word. Otherwise the address is not so clear, is not so firmly held, and does not go to the heart. History therefore is a very precious thing; for what philosophy, wise people and reason teach as to what is useful for honorable living, history gives powerfully with examples and stories, and places it before the eye so that you can see everything which the word placed in the ear. There you find how men have done and lived, so they have been pious and wise, and how it has gone with them and how they have been rewarded. On the other hand, how the bad and foolish have fared. When one considers it, it is from histories and narratives as from a living fountain that have sprung almost all laws, art (or science, "Kunst"), warning, threatenings, comfort, strength, instruction, foresight, wisdom, cleverness, with all the virtues. That is, history is nothing else than an indication, recollection, and monument of divine work and judgment, how the world, particularly men, have been maintained, governed, hindered, furthered, punished and honored, according as each has deserved evil or good . . . Therefore historians are most useful people and most excellent teachers whom we can never sufficiently honor, praise, and thank, and it should be the care of our great lords, as emperors and kings, to have histories of their times written and they should spare no expense to procure persons capable of teaching. . . . But it requires a superior man to write history, a man with a lion-heart, who dares without fear to speak the truth. For most men write in such a way that according to the wishes of their rulers or friends, they pass over the vices or degeneracy of their times, or put the best construction upon them; on the other hand, through partiality for their fatherland and hostility to foreigners, they magnify insignificant virtues,

and eulogize or defame according to prejudices or preferences. In this way histories become untrustworthy and God's work is obscured. Since history describes nothing else than the ways of God, that is, grace and anger, which we should believe as though written in Scripture, it ought to be written with extreme care, fidelity and truth.[1]

Luther's religious point of view makes his interest in history, as in other studies, mainly practical. It is the mirror of virtue and vice, the revelation of divine government, a Book of God,[2] and it was entirely in his spirit that Schiller gave us the frequent and oft quoted words in his poem, Resignation,

Die Weltgeschichte ist das Weltgericht.

Mathematical studies are good, says Luther. They consist in demonstrations, certain proofs, but cannot be used for the Christian faith.[3] Astronomy is a noble science, so far as it shows the works of God; but it should not overstep its bounds. With most of the Humanists, but not with Melanchthon, Luther—as already said—entirely rejected astrology. His enthusiasm for music is so well known that I pass it over.

A religious genius like Luther was not over-sympathetic with philosophy. He did not reject it *in toto*. The chief things of the spirit come to us not from it, but from God's Word, but in lesser matters it has a place. He says,

With all its wisdom, human reason cannot bring us farther than that it instructs the people how they should govern them-

[1] *Vorrede auf die Historia Galeatii Capellae vom Herzog zu Mailand*, 1538, in Erl. Ausg., 63, p. 354 f.; last part transl. by Painter in his *Luther on Education*, 1889, p. 160–2.

[2] *Tischr.*, iv, p. 563, *Op. exeg.*, 22, p. 147, Erl. Ausg., 41, p. 141.

[3] *Tischr.*, iv, pp. 517, 574; Cordatus, p. 118, No. 523, p. 54, no. 233.

selves, honorably live in this temporal passing life, and so best for themselves in this world. How one should govern, keep house, build, and other good arts, one learns in philosophy and heathen books, but not more. How we should know God and his Son and become saved, in matters of God, philosophy knows nothing. But I have nothing against one teaching and learning philosophy. I praise and value it. But let it be modest and remain in its circle. Let it not mix in theology. Let it not call faith an accident or a quality, or say that the right faith abides in us like color in the wall; but faith is a thing in the heart, given by God, which has its nature for itself, as God's own work.[1]

That is Luther's constant attitude. Philosophy has its place and its good points, if it keeps strictly to its own field. But speculation on religious matters founded on anything except God's word is nothing but dreams.[2]

The monograph of F. A. B. Nitzsch has made us familiar with Luther's attitude to Aristotle.[3] The philosopher's doctrine of God and his relation to the world, his cosmology, his doctrine of man, his ethics,—these are irreconcilable with the Christian view. His cold attitude to religion, his books on metaphysics and physics, the soul, ethics,—these should be done away.[4] He wanted him thrown out of the university as a subject of lectures, and on physical matters his place taken by Pliny. He believed Quintillian to have higher pedagogical value.[5] It is fair to say, however, that later Luther took a more favorable view. He finds many useful things in Aristotle's physics, and warns against leaving unread what he says there.[6] While in his Open Letter to the Nobility of the German Nation he rejects Aristotle because he is against the grace of God, knows not how to free the soul from sin, death and hell, and give rest to the anxious conscience, he later confesses that, while not taking

[1] *Tischr.*, i., p. 47–8.
[2] Cordatus, p. 377, no. 1426.
[3] *Luther und Aristoteles*, 1883.
[4] Erl. Ausg., 21, p. 344.
[5] De Wette, i, pp. 57, 99, 238 f., 385.
[6] *Op. exeg.*, 1, p. 164.

back his earlier judgment, he regards Aristotle's Ethics as an excellent and learned book, calls it even a book highly useful for this life, as it best teaches the *philosophia moralis*, that is, how one should live a fine, disciplined external life.[1] When the philosopher does not touch the religious territory but keeps himself to human and civic matters, his diligence and that of other heathen philosophers may be praised.[2] Even in Luther's earlier work of 1520 he makes an exception of Aristotle's Logic, Rhetoric and Poetics, and says that they can well be used.[3] In culture he has formal worth, even if others—especially Cicero—have taught better.[4] In method Aristotle is excellent and he is a shrewd dialectician, but in matter Cicero is far ahead.

In fact, Luther almost forgets himself in his high praise of the Roman philosopher. He says that Cicero far overtops Aristotle in philosophy, that his Offices are much better than Aristotle's Ethics. Who will learn the *Rechtschaffene Philosophia* let him read Cicero. He suffered much, had many cares, yet he had read all the books of the Greeks, had written more books than all the philsosophers, and I hope (continues Luther) that our Lord God will be gracious to him and those like him. Of course we have to abide by the word, He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but whether God could dispense and make a difference among heathen and peoples it is not for us to know as to time and measure. For there shall be a new heaven and new earth much larger and broader than this. He can give to each one according to his pleasure.[5] Cicero came near to several Christian truths.[6] His beautiful, wise teaching *de moribus, de disciplinis, de artibus* deserves the highest acknowledgment.[7]

[1] *Op. exeg.*, 23, p. 319; *Tischr.*, iv, pp. 520, 539
[2] *Op. exeg.*, 2, p. 313.
[3] Erl. Ausg., 21, p. 346.
[4] *Tischr.*, iv, p. 597.
[5] *Ibid.*, iv, p. 597.
[6] Cordatus, p. 117, no. 522.
[7] *Op. exeg.*, 23, p. 319.

Luther had also come to a definite judgment on Plato. Like Aristotle and Cicero, Plato suffers from ignorance of God. Because he seeks God by speculation, he comes to the view that God is nothing and yet everything. Luther also criticizes his doctrine of creation, of the soul, and of politics. Compared with Aristotle, Plato is much better as a philosopher, for he bears a religious stamp, and acknowledges that the world is not eternal and that the soul is immortal. Perhaps he came in touch in Egypt with traditions that sprang from Israel.[1]

Speaking of Luther's separation of philosophy from theology and his rejection of the scholastic structures, we must not think he was blind to the intellectual power of the medieval system-makers. He confesses to the wonderful acuteness of the systems of Thomas, Scotus, and others. He concedes that Peter Lombard wrote many excellent things, and the Fathers generally; and he gladly acknowledges what he has to thank them for, though he is happy that he has been torn away from their theology.[2] For Luther Aristotle's reign in the universities was over. For theology Luther cast him out and with him all philosophy.[3]

It does not belong to this paper to go into Luther's views on school instruction and discipline and other points in pedagogy, which for the English reader can be had in Professor Painter's excellent book, *Luther on Education*, (Phil., 1889). But a word on libraries. It was Luther's idea to see every city and town with its own public library. He exhorted the councillors of all cities to put up or furnish

[1] See *Op. exeg.*, i, pp. 8, 59, 156, 162; ii, pp. 167, 292, 314; iii, p. 28; xviii, p. 180; xx, pp. 48 ff. *Tischr.*, i, p. 162.

[2] *Op. exeg.*, xix, p. 252; xiv, p. 8; *Tischr.*, iv, pp. 386, 389.

[3] See on this (pp. 64–5) the admirable investigation of Zweynert, *Luther's Stellung zur humanistischen Schule und Wissenschaft*, 1895, to which I am much indebted.

good libraries or book-houses, so that people could read, good books be preserved, with science and languages, which we now have by God's grace. Not all books, of course, need be put into these libraries, and he excepts the comments of lawyers, books of theological sentences, philosophical questions, and sermons of monks. He prefers the following: first, the Bible in three or four different languages; second, the best interpreters and the ancients; third, such books as help to teach languages; fourth, poets and orators, regardless whether they were Christian or not; fifth, books of the free sciences and arts and of all other arts; sixth, books of law and medicine, with commentaries; seventh and chief, chronicles and histories in all possible languages as they are of the greatest worth for culture.[1]

The ordinary academic exercises, like disputations, depositions, grades, promotions, Luther was in favor of retaining and improving, if possible. Carlstadt, on the strength of Matt. xxiii, 8, was not favorable to academic promotions. On the other hand, Luther exhorted the people in the church that they keep the ceremonies in universities and schools, hold God in honor, as these ceremonies are useful to religion and discipline; upon which the youth see how and whereto good sciences or arts are useful and necessary. Languages (especially Latin) are useful to all, who can thus speak to foreign nations and go around among them, and not remain only German brothers. And parents can give no better treasure to their children than allow them to study and learn good sciences or arts.[2]

Another line of inquiry as to Luther's relation to culture is his knowledge and use of the Greek and Latin classics.

[1] Erl. Ausg., 22, pp. 194, 197. In *Tischr.*, i, p. 97, speaking of God's gifts to us, Luther says he has not given us different languages and good free arts or science in vain; all kind of good books we can buy now cheaply; he gives us learned men to teach rightly, so that a boy can learn more now in a year than formerly in several years.

[2] *Tischr.*, iv, p. 552–3.

This I have not left space to touch. It has been investigated thoroughly in a most interesting monograph by Dr. Pfarrer Oswald Gottlob Schmidt in one of the most useful products of the great Reformation year 1883, *Luthers Bekanntschaft mit den alten Classikern*, with surprising results to those who have not paid attention to Luther's humanistic side. His sincere modesty and apologetic attitude toward Erasmus and other Humanists does not prepare us for the richness of his knowledge of the classics as shown in innumerable references, quotations, criticisms, *etc.*, scattered through his works, as well as his own Latin poems and imitations. Schmidt opens up a new world to the ordinary Luther student. "For the richness and peculiarities of Greek idiom Luther in his fine linguistic feeling had a living understanding. Numerous points of contact of Greek and German awoke in him the wish that as a language for the learned in Germany Greek might prevail rather than Latin," (p. 49).

Classical studies were the noblest refreshment of spirit for him in his conflict-moved life. We know the indefinable refreshing breath which proceeds from antiquity and the treasures stored in it of poetry, philosophy and history, and which is expressed in the beautiful words of Cicero, *pro Archia*, 7: "These studies nourish adolescence, delight age, adorn ordinary affairs, furnish refuge and solace in adversity, allure at home, do not hinder business, pass the night with us, go on our journeys, and live in the country." That breath followed Luther in the gloomy monotonous cloister cell at Erfurt and protected him here from the danger of intellectual pining away. During his stay in Coburg it scattered many a dark cloud, and remained with him a beloved companion through his whole life. Luther would not so often have turned to the ancient authors, not so often have spoken of them and enriched and adorned his own speech from their treasure, had he not lived in them and in them had his inner joy. When often his temporary inclination to lathe-turning and

gardening as effective means of recreation is mentioned, an older writer has rightly referred here to his "intercourse with the beautiful sciences." (pp. 60-62).

"The newly awakened Humanism enlarged him mightily, and opened for him everywhere new sources of knowledge. Not the least Luther had to thank it for the unique breadth of view of his spirit" (p. 62). I must forbear further quotations from this fascinating treatise of Schmidt.

It was inevitable in the relations of the times that Cicero must wane and Paul must wax, that Luke should shove Livy to one side. But Melanchthon warned against any despisal of classical study and deeply complained of any backward step in this regard.[1] And the minute researches of Schmidt have shown that Luther himself highly regarded these studies and emphatically recommended them.

[1] *Corp. Ref.*, i, pp. 575, 604, 613, 679, *etc.* (Schmidt, *op. cit.*, p. 64.)

Church Historical Research and Library Cooperation

By

Ernest Cushing Richardson

CHURCH HISTORICAL RESEARCH AND LIBRARY COOPERATION.

By Ernest Cushing Richardson, Ph.D., Honorary Director of the Library and Research Professor in Bibliography, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.

(Read December 30, 1923)

THE poverty of our American libraries in research books is a matter of almost daily observation in research libraries. We are rich in the books for learning and teaching, that is, in all the machinery for spreading common knowledge; but when it comes to the search for new knowledge, those sciences which, like history and philology, find their chief sources in books, are handicapped at every turn. It was estimated three or four years ago that there are at least five million live research books in the world, *i.e.*, books liable to be sought at the reference desk any day. Of these it was said perhaps one million can be found in the great reference libraries, another million exist in America somewhere, if only they could be located, and the rest are only to be found abroad. Since that time it has been found that both the number which can be found and the number in America which might be found are increasing rapidly, but the problem is still very far from approaching solution. Every few weeks, if not oftener, any one actively engaged in research work runs up against a concrete instance. The writer has already met several during the first month of the academic year. The most recent is as typical as any. A graduate student is at work on a sup-

posedly unpublished manuscript of an old English version of the Revelations of St. Bridget of Sweden. It was discovered, however, that there were three or four editions of English translations of some of these Revelations shortly after 1520, and several more in the nineteenth century. The problem is whether any of these are editions of this version. If not, and perhaps in any event, a critical edition of this version would be of considerable value linguistically and perhaps theologically. The usual reference and lending department machinery was put in operation, the usual libraries were written to, and the most likely theological libraries in addition. The sole result was a partial translation found in the Library of the Catholic University at Washington, which, on examination, proves to be a different edition and different text from any of the translations found bibliographically. It is a new version from the Latin, and the translator is under the same impression that we were to begin with,—that this was the first appearance (1851) of any English translation of the work. It is of more than bibliographical importance to compare all of these translations, but so far no copy of any other edition has been located. This is the daily research problem in a nutshell.

Undoubtedly the best solution for the problem is a joint catalogue of all unusual books, showing in what libraries they can be found. Such catalogues have been made of scientific periodicals, collections on European history, and other specialties. A joint catalogue of periodicals in general is now being planned by a Committee of the American Library Association, but it does not touch the problem of the unusual book. It is expressly limited to the commonest ten percent of periodicals, *i.e.*, those least difficult to find by the ordinary method.

On the other hand, the Library of Congress has during the last few years made a superb start on a joint catalogue of

books not in the Library of Congress itself, by exchanging its cards with other libraries which print their cards; Chicago University, Harvard, the John Crerar Library, the New York Public Library, the Boston Public, and others. Various other libraries have partial joint catalogues formed by a union of published cards. These, like the cards of the Library of Congress joint lists, are of very great importance for local use.

The Library of Congress adds also manuscript cards from other sources. It welcomes cards for unusual books from any and all libraries, and is glad to incorporate these in its joint list, which already numbers between two and three million cards and is proving a source of incalculable value, both for bibliographical and for library cataloguing purposes.

The rapid progress of these catalogues has been wholly unexpected, and points towards a really simple rough solution of the whole problem in the near future, because these can be used as a basis from which to judge what material is still wholly lacking and what geographical localities are unsupplied. When this is determined, it will be an easy matter for libraries to organize cooperation in supplying the lacks by complementing instead of duplicating one another.

The problem is, however, by no means yet solved, and the suggestion having been made that it could be solved for theology by cooperation of the 200 more or less theological libraries, first by a joint catalogue of these libraries and then by distributing the burden of purchase, it seemed worth while to make a little experiment as to the actual facts of American library resources for theological study. Visits were made to perhaps a score of theological libraries and half a dozen of the large reference and research libraries to test the matter out. A joint catalogue was made of a very small section of the alphabet—Aa through Aba—

exclusive of Abaelard, who is generally entered as Abailard, or Abelard.

The result was surprising and suggestive. About ninety titles were found in the libraries visited and in the joint catalogue of the Library of Congress. Of these only twenty-seven titles were found in more than one library. The largest number found in any theological library was six, showing that the main reliance for theological research is not the theological libraries but the great reference libraries. As a matter of fact, Harvard University buys more books for theological research than any of the excellent Cambridge Theological Libraries.

This surprising fact is matched for surprise by the fact that the total number of titles which can be reached through the Library of Congress and its union catalogue, together with the New York Public, the Boston Public, and Harvard, greatly exceeds the number of titles to be found in the British Museum or in the Paris National Library. We commonly suppose that a London worker or Paris worker has a great advantage over the American worker and in fact he has, except for the union catalogue. With this aid one can, in the Library of Congress, consult on the spot or learn the location of more titles than are in either the British Museum or the National Library of Paris.

The ratio of books in London, Paris, and the twenty libraries joint-listed in America is forty-eight at the British Museum, to thirty-eight at Paris, and ninety in America: four to five to nine.

It is a curiously interesting fact that less than ten per cent of the titles in London and Paris duplicate one another and less than ten per cent of those in the American libraries are in either the London or Paris libraries.

The section studied is too small (about one five-thousandth of the alphabet) for close generalizations, but the figures point to at least a million theological titles of

sufficient value to be included in the printed catalogue of a great library and not to be found in the Library of Congress or its joint catalogue.

Recent investigations tend to show that the number of titles not to be found in the world's great libraries is much larger than supposed. The world's stock of books is estimated by the Brussels' Institute as 12,000,000 volumes and it has accumulated by clipping printed titles, a joint catalogue containing six million author cards.

When the Committee on Intellectual Cooperation of the League of Nations was formed, it started with the idea of encouraging the foundation of several universal international libraries, but it seems to have quite given this up in favor of the encouragement of the Brussels' Repertory and similar joint lists.

The logic and common sense of the situation is plain. The attempt to supply research needs by casual and desultory accessions and equally desultory essays in joint lists, is improving the case all the time, but at an expense for duplication in purchase, housing and cataloguing so vast as to represent many times the rather high cost of an organized effort to meet the whole problem at an early date. Meeting this at an early date would further save valuable research time to an amount many times greater than the cost involved.

The situation is so plain that it should be easy to get capital with which to carry the plan through. For that matter, present capital if organized might be able to do it almost without aid,—the methods are now so well understood by actual experiment in the fundamental lines, *i.e.*, joint lists and joint purchase.

A joint list of a couple of thousand collections in European history, *e.g.* showed hundreds of deficiencies, but the mere publication of the list resulted within three or four years in supplying all but half a dozen somewhere and nearly all in at least three geographical localities.

During the last three years two small experiments have been made in purchasing good material when found cheap, and on the basis of a simple agreement of a few large libraries to absorb duplicates. Less than one-fifth of the material purchased is to be found in the usual libraries and not more than one-half of this is in more than one library. The purchases for the last year contained, for example, two or three dozen works on the local history of Huguenotism in France. Most of these were not to be found in American libraries through the ordinary channels, and the books were used immediately after arrival. This last fact points to the most important aspect of the whole situation—the fact that the mere having of these books leads to their use.

Certain theological libraries have now taken up the matter for their well-defined speciality—all along the line of the question whether it will not be possible to organize the cooperation, selection, purchase, cataloguing and lending. All who have worked any field of research in church history will appreciate the value of this. If they will lend a hand to the publicity of the need, there seems no reason why librarians should not apply the solution on a right scale.

Protestantism in the Ukraine

By

Basil Kusiw

PROTESTANTISM IN THE UKRAINE

By the Rev. Basil Kusiw, Instructor in the Ukrainian Language and Literature at Bloomfield Theological Seminary, Bloomfield, N. J.

(*Read December 30, 1923*)

PROTESTANTISM and the Ukraine are a combination strange to the mind of a Western man. He who has been taught to look on the Ukraine as a province of greater Russia regards the Ukraine as being as much Russian and Orthodox as Moskovia.

The Russian Church division (roskol) of the eighteenth century, and the later Russian sects of mystic and ritualistic character have nothing in common with Protestantism, which bases its faith on the scientific interpretation of the Bible. "Roskol," or old belief, was a formalistic, ritualistic variant of the Russian orthodox official Church, whilst the Russian sects—Skoptzi, Molokany, Chlysty, Duchobory, and the like—represent rather the vulgarizing and specious misinterpretation of Christianity. One may find some printed information about these various sects in the English language, usually prepared by Protestant authors. But you will find nothing, or next to nothing, in English sources about the past and present Ukrainian Protestantism. For instance, Fr. C. Conybeare in his otherwise excellent work "Dissenters of Russia" knows nothing about Ukrainian Protestantism in the past, and counts the modern movement as among the "small sects," to which he dedicates only three pages of his voluminous work, without being able to say much about it.

Such lack of knowledge of the comparatively strong Ukrainian Protestantism, is due to the official Russian press and diplomacy. In the last one hundred years it has succeeded in forcing upon the world the conviction that the territory which stretches from the Black Sea and the Carpathian Mountains to the Arctic Ocean and Siberia is inhabited by one race only, one nation with one language, with one tradition, one culture and one religion, whose history begins one thousand years ago, the city of Kiev being its centre at first, and now Moscow. Consequently the history of the Ukrainian religious church life was identified with that of Russia, but in reality it was just in this field that the ways of these two countries diverged from one another. The Russian Church historians, and following them the Protestant historians, turn their attention wholly to the Russian official Orthodox Church, and disregard the Ukrainian Church, which really was predominant till the fourteenth century in Eastern Europe. At that time the Russian Church freed herself from the supremacy of Kiev, and assumed a strong reactionary attitude, while the Ukrainian Church remained open to the influences of Catholicism and Protestantism.

In the sixteenth century we find here a strong Protestant movement which made deep impressions upon the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. Lack of Protestantism in Russia, and its acceptance in the Ukraine came to the attention of the distinguished Ukrainian scholar, M. Drahomaniw, in the eighth decade of the last century. He was Professor of History in Kiev University and later in Sofia, Bulgaria.[1] He explained the cause of this phenomenon by referring to the differences in the history of culture, and of the racial psychology of these two nations. The Ukrainians from the very beginning of their history came under the influence of the Mediterranean, at first Hellenic and later Latin, culture.

[1] See M. Drahomaniw: *The Ukrainian Baptists*, 1880.

Till the thirteenth century, there were close commercial and cultural relations with Constantinople, and with the colonies of the Italian republics, Genoa and Venice, in the Crimea. From the fourteenth century on (through Lithuania, Hanseatic cities, later through Poland) the Ukraine came under the influence of Latinism, Humanism and the Reformation, *i.e.*, of Western European culture. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in all higher schools in the Ukraine, from Lemberg to Charkow, the Latin language was taught and Western, European methods were adopted. Meanwhile, Moskovia received, until the thirteenth century, the Byzantine influence through the mediation of Kiev. After the invasion of the Tartars, she broke off her relations with Kiev, established her own, autocephalic Church, came almost into no contact with the rest of Europe, excepting Constantinople. The traces of these religious and cultural influences are seen even in the style of the church buildings. The characteristic, onionlike cupola of Russian churches is taken from the Grusians (Caucasus). The great number of cupolas and chimerically curved (broken) lines of the walls are taken from Chinese and Hindu designs. In the Ukraine the Byzantine style was mixed with the Roman, later with the Renaissance, and still later with the baroque style.

The second reason that the Ukraine accepted rational Protestantism, while Muskovia produced the mystical or ritualistic sects, which were sometimes of obscure and pathological character, Drahomaniw finds in the racial psychology of the two peoples.

He and two other prominent Ukrainian historians call attention to the scientific mind of the Ukrainian and his conception of religion as the source of a morality that comes from the idea of God as love, while the Muskovite conception lays stress either on mysticism or external formalism. Other scholars, Conybeare among them, point out traces of Finnish

Shamaism in Russian sectarianism,—a cult of selected women, sexualism, orgies, including practicing of sodomy.

These remarks as to the differences of the religious thought between the Ukrainian and the Muscovite were necessary in order to remove the impression that the religious life of Russia and that of the Ukraine are identical. Up to the time of Peter the Great or rather Catherine II, *i.e.*, up to the year 1800, Moscovia remained a merely nominally Christian country, like Abyssinia to-day, while the Ukraine was in the circle of Western civilization. The nineteenth century has unified to a large extent the culture of these two countries, but the Revolution of 1917 in Russia and the Ukraine has caused a break between these two countries, and the religious life of the Ukraine now strives to free itself from the Russian unification programme.

To understand the Ukrainian Protestantism of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, one must also recall the circumstances under which it originated and present the religious past of the country. The Ukraine accepted the Christian faith officially from Constantinople during the reign of Vladimir the Great in 988, with the so-called old Slavonic language in the services.

This was really but the confirmation of a fact, for Christianity had been spreading in the Ukraine for a century before that date, as the result of commercial relations with Constantinople and Bulgaria. The new Ukrainian Church was officially under the rule of the Greek Church, for the Church in Kiev was subordinated to the patriarch of Constantinople. It is worth while to remember that at that time the religious character of the Ukrainians was of a high order. The bishops, for instance, could demand that the princes and nobles lead a moral life and exercise righteous government; and if there were any conflicts of the Church with the rulers, these were caused by unrighteous nobles. On the other hand such movements as Iconoclasm

find no echoes in the Ukraine. The schism between the Eastern and the Western Churches caused no struggle in the Ukraine, for it was there considered as a political rather than a religious affair.

The conquest of the Ukraine by Lithuania, and later by Poland, in the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries brings the Ukraine into direct contact with Western influences, after Constantinople had been taken by the Turks. Previously the commercial roads of the Ukraine led by way of the Dnieper and Dniester Rivers to the Black Sea and Constantinople. Now these roads were blocked. New commercial roads led by way of the Bug, to the Vistula and Danzig, or by way of the Dvina to Riga and the Baltic, or by land from Lemberg to Prague, Dresden, and the like. From Bohemia and Germany the influences of Latin culture were pouring flood-like into the Ukraine, especially into her Western provinces.

In 1397 the Lithuanian princes established a school home for Lithuanian and Ukrainian students at the University in Prague. The Ukrainians took part in the wars of the Hussites and Taborites, and their connections with them left traces even in the Ukrainian vocabulary; for instance, "tabor" meaning camp, and "hetman" meaning leader.

The first movement of the new faith that found sympathizers in the Ukraine was that of the Judaizers, who rejected the Trinity, the sacraments, images, the cross, fasting, monasteries, and the Virgin birth. But they were the first to translate some books of the Bible into the Ukrainian language. This new faith found adherents among the people of higher education, but naturally could not get much of a following among the masses. Although it did not leave any deep impression, it prepared for future changes.

Francis Skoryna, who studied medicine in Prague and Padua, a friend of Melanchthon, published in Prague for the first time the Psalter, 1517, later the Pentateuch, in the

then Ukrainian literary language, and still later other books of the Old Testament, and in Vilna, 1525, the Epistles of the New Testament.

The translations of Skoryna were of epochal importance in the history of the Ukrainian language, literature and culture. These translations were made from the Bohemian (Hussite) Bible and the Slavonic Church text, that had been used thus far in the Ukraine. Other translations followed, and from a linguistic point of view, the so-called Persopnytzke Gospel, 1561, was of the greatest value, as it was published in comparatively pure Ukrainian and translated from Bohemian, Slavonic, and Latin texts. These numerous translations of the Bible into the national language of the Ukrainians were made under the influence of Hussites and Lutherans, but had not that marked Protestant tendency which is to be found in the later translation of the Gospels by the Ukrainian nobleman Nehalewski.

This translation, from the Polish translation of the Bible by the Socinian Martin Czechowicz, had a Socinian tendency, as revealed in the introductory remarks.

We find the first news about Socinians in the Ukraine in 1540, and very soon they overflowed, almost the whole of Wolhyn, Polisia, and partly the Kiev region. Of their publications the most remarkable was the Calvinistic Catechism of Simeon Budnyj, translated into the Ukrainian language. The funds for its publication were provided by Prince Radivil and the Great Chancellor Gustave Volovicz of the Lithuanian Ukrainian State. This Catechism was a collection of the theological treatises directed against the Catholic and Orthodox Churches. The second work of Budnyj, *The Justification of Sinful Man before God*, is anti-trinitarian in character; this is true also of Tiapinski's Gospel translated from Budnyj's Polish text.

How strong the Socinian influence in the Ukraine was can be inferred from the following data. In the middle of

the sixteenth century in Nowhorod County there were 650 Socinian churches and of 600 noblemen's families only 16 remained Orthodox, and Socinians were engaged as teachers in the principal Orthodox academies and as writers of polemic books against the Roman Catholics, in defense of the Orthodox Church.

But quickly as Socinianism spread, it quickly disappeared. This was due to the social and religious struggle between the Ukraine and Poland.

In 1569 a political union between Lithuania and Poland at the expense of the Ukraine was concluded. Notwithstanding the strong opposition of the Ukrainians, their country, which so far had been a part of the Lithuanian-Ukrainian state, was divided by Lithuania and Poland.

Poland entered upon a national, religious, and social oppression of the Ukrainians. Her attack was specially directed against the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, as the mainstay of the Ukrainian nationalism. The political struggle raged in the diets; the cultural, in church, school and literature; and at last both sides took to arms, and Ukrainian revolts followed one after another. In this fight, which took the character of the struggle of the Ukrainian masses against the Polish nobility, two camps stood against each other; the Polish-aristocratic was Catholic, and the Ukrainian-democratic was Orthodox. The Protestants found themselves between anvil and hammer, and in the course of wars and riots joined one side or the other. For instance, George Nemyrycz, a Ukrainian nobleman, brought up in Holland, and a leader of Ukrainian Protestants, took part in the Ukrainian revolution, occupied the office of Secretary of State (Chancellor) under hetman J. Wyhowskyj, the successor to Bohndan Chmelnitzkyj, the victor over the Poles and the founder of the Ukrainian Cossack Republic in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Nemyrycz was also the author of the so-called

Hadiacz Treaty, on the basis of which the Ukraine was to join the federation with Poland (1658) and Lithuania, as the third equal member. Nothing was gained by this treaty. As Nemyrycz and others joined the Ukrainian Orthodox side, and consequently turned back to the Orthodox Church, the other Ukrainian Protestants, recruited from noblemen, scared by the democratic character of the Ukrainian Revolution, took the Polish side and gradually became Catholics; the more so, because the Jesuits in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries began to control schools, press, and government. This long and fierce Ukrainian-Polish fight explains the full and rapid decline of the Ukrainian Protestant movement.

When two elements engaged in a battle, of which one found expression in Roman Catholicism, the other in Orthodoxy, there was no room for the third element, Protestantism. It died, because both warring sides were extremely intolerant of other religions than their own. The Poles and the Ukrainians watched Socinian Protestants with suspicion, maintaining that they were not loyal to their particular political cause. In Poland the Protestants were deprived of all rights, and were exterminated, and in the Ukraine they voluntarily joined the democratic and autocephalic Orthodox Church. Thus Ukrainian Orthodoxy in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries came under the strong democratic influence of the Protestant movement.

We have already mentioned Francis Skoryna and other translators of the Bible, who had some connection with the Protestants, and have also stated that Protestants taught in Ukrainian Orthodox schools. This fraternization was the result of the oppression of both of them by the common enemy, Catholicism. In many diets the Protestant and Orthodox jointly defended the freedom of conscience and equal rights against the Catholic government, which, since 1600, was under control of Jesuits.

The position of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the Polish-Lithuanian state gave this Church an aureole of democracy. The Church was practically autonomous, for the exarch-metropolitan of Kiev was only theoretically under the supremacy of the Constantinopolitan patriarch. Ukrainian Princes, till the invasion of Mongols, and later Lithuanian princes, at that time rulers of the Ukraine, accepted the Orthodox faith, and by the power of their office nominated the bishops and exarchs, the patriarch approving them.

After the federation of Lithuania with Poland these princes, for the sake of the Polish crown, accepted the Polish Catholic faith. Since that time the policy of these Polish-Lithuanian kings was not to appoint Orthodox Ukrainian bishops, but to put Catholics in their places, and thus to end the existence of the Orthodox Church. And probably the whole Ukraine would have been made Catholic, and consequently Polish, but for the organization of the Ukrainian Church-brotherhoods, the growth of the military strength, and the general mode of thought, of the Ukrainian Cossacks, who dwelt in the basin of the Dnieper.

These "Church-Brotherhoods" are the pride of Ukrainian cultural history. In the course of the sixteenth century they were the predominant factor in the cultural development of the schools, the Church and the national consciousness of the Ukraine. But they were absolutely the outcome of the Reformation in the West. The first of them was organized at Lemberg 1463. It was Bohemian-Hussite influence that gave it birth. As was said above, the Bohemian Protestant democracy of the fifteenth century was in close contact with the Ukraine. The Ukrainian Orthodox burghers were in danger of being oppressed by German Catholic burghers who were brought into the Ukraine by the Polish kings and were granted special privileges. To defend themselves, the Ukrainians organized

themselves into religious cultural societies in connection with local churches. Their aim was the support of the Orthodox Church, mutual assistance of the members, the establishing of schools, printing shops, etc. The administrative organization was democratic in principle and practice, while the Catholic and Orthodox Churches were now autocratic in principle and practice. One of the reasons that led the Orthodox bishops to seek union with Rome was their endeavor to get rid of the control of democratic burghers. A conflict between brotherhoods and bishops broke out, and as some bishops were forced to seek help in Rome, they concluded a union with Rome 1596. But the brotherhood of Lemberg developed so rapidly and gained such power, that it could dictate to the bishop of that town. It established its own college, school, and the largest printing shop in Eastern Europe, which flourishes to the present time. The patriarchs of Constantinople, seeing the inclination of the bishops toward Rome, relieved the brotherhood from episcopal jurisdiction and put it under their direct control. It became a Church in the Church. Following Lemberg, hundreds of Ukrainian cities organized their own brotherhoods with colleges, schools, and printing shops, that later united into one central organization. This democratic system of lay government in the Church was more liberal and less orthodox than the church hierarchy, for in them glowed the spirit of the Reformation. If the Polish-Ukrainian war had not been started, that brought economic ruin to the Ukrainian cities, this brotherhood movement, directed equally against the Catholic and the Orthodox hierarchies, would eventually have turned out to be pure Protestantism. The same reasons that undermined the Socianism among the noblemen undermined the Ukrainian burgher movement in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. But the brotherhoods left deep cultural traces, and established scores of Ukrainian colleges and lyceums, where the Latin

language was taught. The Western, European system of education was adopted and many printing shops established, that kept the Ukraine in contact with Western Europe, while Russia remained stagnant.

The second factor that stopped the advance of Catholicism in the East, and at the same time of Protestantism, was the Ukrainian Cossack democracy. Ukrainian Cossacks must not be confused with the Russian Cossacks on the Don or Ural. "Cossack" means a light-armed cavalryman and a free fighter. Both organizations had the same beginning and motive: the necessity of defense against the Tartar hordes in the Crimea and the Caspian steppes.

The Ukrainian Cossacks gained territorial autonomy along the middle Dnieper, and after 1600 they became a threatening power against Tartars, Turks, and Poles. The Ukrainian noblemen disciplined them into military organizations, and pupils of the brotherhood schools imbued them with the national and religious idea of struggle against Poland for the freedom of the Ukraine and of the Church, and for the emancipation of the peasantry. Their system of government was representative. After 1600 they started war with Poland, with the outcome that the Ukrainian Orthodox hierarchy was restored; only that now it was to be elective. Poland was weakened. Since that time, the principle of the election of the hierarchy by the peoples' representatives was practiced in the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. Democratized, Westernized, and secularized by the Reformation, the Ukrainian Church now began a successful war against Romanism and Polonism. But this democracy and lay-rule in the Church retarded the development of the Orthodox faith into pure Protestantism in the Ukraine. The new Ukrainian Cossack republic created in the seventeenth century, after fierce battles with Poland, joins the anti-Catholic union of Protestant states—Brandenburg, Transylvania, Sweden, against the Catholic bloc of

Poland and Hapsburg. But the Ukraine had no opportunity at that time to go further in the religious reformation. The great hetman of the Ukraine, B. Chmelnitzky, was a friend of the Elector of Brandenburg, of George Rakoczy, Charles Gustave, and Cromwell, Jr. Together with Rakoczy of Transylvania, and Charles Gustave of Sweden, he almost achieved the division of Poland in 1655. His death delayed this plan, and forced the Ukraine to seek help against Poland and the Tartars by means of a federation with Russia, which in the end fully annexed the Ukraine under Catherine II, exterminating the Ukrainian culture and above all the Ukrainian Church. The autonomy of the Church brotherhoods and Latin schools was abolished, printing shops were closed, the election of the hierarchy by them prohibited, the Ukrainian Church was placed under the Synod of Moskow and the Czar, while Ukrainian bishops were displaced by bishops sent from Moskow.

Complete reactionary methods of church activities were the result of these Russian "Reforms." The church language was Russified, the Ukrainian language and sermons prohibited; the Church thus became an organ of denationalization, oppression, and espionage.

It did not take long to see evidences of this shameful change. While in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the culture of the Ukraine flourished and the religious life, whether in Protestant or Orthodox form, stood comparatively high, we witness in the nineteenth century the full decline of culture in the Ukraine, and the loss of influence of the Church on the Ukrainian masses. Illiteracy, drunkenness, general depravity, distrust of the Church and priests reign in the Ukrainian territories. Ukrainian intellectuals, separated through the influence of the Russian school from the people and their tradition, were absorbed either by the official Russified orthodoxy, or by atheistic liberalism, nihilism, socialism, and anarchism, influenced by

the shallow propaganda of parties. Only small groups remained faithful to the national traditions, suffering in exile or prisons. But it is neither accidental nor peculiar, that those Ukrainian intellectuals who remained faithful and loyal to their nationality were at the same time sincere evangelical Christians, although officially not connected with any established evangelical church. Such is true of the Ukrainian "trinity," the poet Shevczenko, the scholar Kulish, translator of the Bible into the national Ukrainian language, and the historian Kostomariw. The poems of Shevczenko are permeated by deep religious feeling. He is the author of two spirited poems: "John Huss," wherein he prays, that all Slavs may become the sons of the Sun of righteousness, and heretics like the great heretic of Constance; and "Church-grave," wherein he characterizes the Russian official Church as a grave. We herewith reprint a translation of one of Shevczenko's poems, entitled "Iconoclasm."

Bright light, peaceful light,
Free light, light unbound!
What is this, brother light?
In thy warm home thou'rt found
By censers smoked
By priest's robes choked,
Fettered and fooled
And by Ikons ruled.
Yield thee not in the fight,
Waken up, brother light!
Shed thy pure rays
On mankind's ways.
All priestly robes in rags we'll tear
And light our pipes from censers rare,
With Ikons now the flames will roar,
With holy brooms we'll sweep the floor.

It is a remarkable thing, that the secret political-national society, which this "Trinity" organized in 1845 had in its program the freedom of the Ukraine in federation with Slavs, emancipation of peasants, establishing of a democratic republic, and bore the name of "Society of St. Cyril and Methodius," apostles to the Slavs. It was chiefly moved by principles of the Evangelical faith.

But this group had no opportunity in their day to exert their influence on the ignorant masses. They were imprisoned, and their literary activity in Russia prohibited. Thereafter the growth of the Socialistic propaganda against the government got hold of the young minds, leaving no room for the religious questions.

But some of the people, left to themselves in their religious longings, found a better way. As early as 1817, in the region of Odessa, where the ancestors of the Ukrainian Cossacks are still living, a new religious group appeared. At the head of it were the peasants Rutushnyj, Raboshapka and Cymbal. They were the neighbors of German colonists, who settled there after the time of Catherine II, and whose religious peculiarity was known as Stundism. It originated in Norway in 1700, came to Denmark and Germany, and at last to the German colonies in the Ukraine. This term Stundism is derived from the German word for prayer-meeting, "Gebetstunde." The above named three Ukrainian peasants attended German prayer meetings, and introduced them to their villagers. In the beginning, pastor Bonekempher, who had learned the Ukrainian language and also conducted Ukrainian prayer meetings, advised Stundists not to break off the relations with the Orthodox Church. His advice was probably caused by the lack of Ukrainian leaders, or by fear of persecution, which often ended in deportation or death. In 1870 we find a similar movement in the Kiev region caused by German Baptists and Mennonites, who began to establish separate Ukrainian Evangelical

congregations. They called themselves Baptists or "*Brethren of Christ.*" Since that time the new movement grew rapidly in different parts of the Ukraine, and along the border line of Galicia. In 1900 the Stundists counted two million souls. Some sources give as high a figure as eight million, which ranks them second in the list of Ukrainian churches.

We have thus far no critical, objective study of Ukrainian Stundism. Russian official authors, like arch-presbyter Rozhdestvenski, and others, naturally pass one-sided and unfavorable judgments on them, frequently securing their information from court records of the trials of Stundists by the Russian government. More reliable and objective information of this movement is given by a Ukrainian writer, Trochim Zinkowski, before 1906, who had friends and relatives among Ukrainian Stundists and who treats them from a sympathetic point of view. But his work *Ukrainian Stundists*[1] is even in Europe a bibliographical rarity, and not a single copy of it has been found in America. The already mentioned Ukrainian scholar and folklorist, Michael Drahomaniw, is able to say little about the Stundists in his pamphlet *The Ukrainian Baptists* (1880). He himself died as an Evangelical Christian. Other modern Ukrainian writers did not take much interest in this new Church, as their minds were fully occupied with the political struggle of the Ukraine; those with socialistic tendencies looked at Stundism as fanaticism; and other writers considered it a means of Russification of the Ukrainians. This view was due to the fact that the Baptist Boards of Foreign Missions in Frankfurt and in Stockholm favored the Russian translation of the Bible and other Russian Evangelical literature, although there existed a very good Ukrainian translation of the Bible, published by the British Bible Society. These foreign Boards, that discouraged the Ukrainian Evangelicals

[1] Trochim Zinkowski: *The Ukrainian Stundists.*

from using the Ukrainian language, were following the policy of the Russian Government against the Ukrainians. But it kept away, from this otherwise desirable movement, patriotic and at the same time religious intellectuals. The Revolution in 1917 took off the yoke from the Ukrainian language and gave freedom of conscience to the Ukrainian Protestants.

The doctrine of this Church, as far as I have been able to learn, consists of 15 articles of faith, a mixture of Lutheran, Calvinistic, and Baptist elements. They believe in original sin and the depravity of man's nature, in predestination, etc. The most important means of grace are: the Bible, baptism, breaking of bread, communion of saints, repentance, and prayer. The local church government consists of presbyters and teachers, assisted by deacons or servants. They acknowledge only the baptism of adults, and these are baptized in the rivers. Once a month they have communion service in houses of prayer, for which purpose any place may serve. The general service consists of reading and exposition of the Bible, prayer and singing of hymns. The Bible is the only rule of faith. The younger members of their congregations, especially in the Kiev territory, became more radical and separated from the old Baptist organization, declining to acknowledge the power of presbyters, and not paying much attention to any formalism, but laying special emphasis on regeneration. The Bible is liberally interpreted, sometimes allegorically, by this younger movement, which is also inclined toward Christian communism.

The Revolution of 1917 has freed this Church from government persecution, and has caused the Ukrainian *intelligenzia* to be favorably inclined towards it. Especially the Ukrainian political exiles in Bohemia, who number about 50,000, among them over 2000 university students, begin to take interest in the new religious movement under the influence of the Bohemian religious awakening, the

American Young Men's Christian Association, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, the last having missionary stations among them.

It may sound strange, but it is true, that American and Canadian Protestantism among the Ukrainians must be connected with the Stundists in the Ukraine. It is a fact, that many of our Protestant converts in America were influenced directly by the new movement in the Ukraine or by publications in regard to it.

But besides the Stundist movement in the Ukraine, there is also a strong tendency in the Ukrainian Orthodox Church toward a Reformation in the spirit of the New Testament, and if properly assisted by the Protestant Churches in Europe and America, it may in due time be turned into pure Protestantism. The Ukrainian Stundists, the exiles in Bohemia, the Presbyterians and Baptists in America and Canada are all beginning to co-operate. The moral leadership in this co-operation must lie on the shoulders of the Ukrainian Protestants in America, who enjoy freedom, peace, and a close connection with Anglo-Saxon Protestantism. But their numbers are yet small, and leaders are just in the course of preparation.

The Ukraine is ready to accept Protestantism as a living, democratic and practical religion that could give back to the Ukraine, morally devastated by the Russian Orthodox Church, by Socialism, and Communism, the new moral strength without which a desirable national life is impossible. If the present moment is carefully utilized, more can be done than could have been done in a century at any other time. The union of the Ukraine with Protestant countries would be a fact of great importance in the history of Eastern Europe, because the Ukraine is the key to that part of the Old World economically, politically, strategically, as well as religiously. The American Protestants have labored diligently for scores of years in Armenia, although the

circumstances were and are less favorable. Why not take hold of this inviting field, ripe for the harvest?

The Ukraine stretches her hand toward Protestantism, but it is generally ignored, mainly because the Protestants look at the Ukraine through Russian eyeglasses. Rome has grasped the situation much more correctly and quickly.

The Greek Catholic uniat metropolitan of Lemberg, Count Andrew Shepticki, convinced the pope as to the religious value of the Ukraine in Rome's "Drang nach Osten" and therefore Rome sends her missionaries to the Ukraine to win it for Romanism. But it is not Rome, it is rather the Gospel of Jesus Christ, that Ukraine needs and is willing to accept, and the Protestant Church ought to give it to this land.

The Reverend James I. Good, D.D., as a Church Historian

By
George Warren Richards

THE REVEREND JAMES I. GOOD, D.D., LL.D., AS A CHURCH HISTORIAN

By the Rev. George Warren Richards, D.D., President of the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the United States, Lancaster, Pa.

(*Read December 29, 1924*)

TO understand the historical work of Dr. Good we shall have to consider certain facts of his early life and training. When he died at the age of seventy-three, he was a notable figure, not only in the Reformed Church in the United States, of which he was a member from childhood, but also among the Protestant Churches of America and Europe. Few men of any Church in this country were more widely known, and, in some respects, more highly esteemed than he. At the meeting of the Alliance of Reformed Churches throughout the World holding the Presbyterian System, at Pittsburgh, in 1921, Professor M. A. Curtiss of Scotland, in reporting for the Eastern Section, said: "I do not think that since the days of Dr. Schaff, and to go even further back, since the days of John Dury, the old apostle of Church Unity for Scotland, there has been a Presbyterian friend to our weak and threatened churches compared to Professor Good of Philadelphia."

Soon after his death the following resolutions were sent from Hungary to the Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Reformed Church:

"Under the Hope of a Happy Resurrection

The Seminary of Pápa of the Trans-Danubian Synod with sad heart wishes to convey their condolences:

Their Honorary Professor in the Theological School,
Dr. James I. Good,

died peacefully in the Lord in his 75th [74th] year at Philadelphia on January 21st, 1924. In trying times he was our faithful friend. With deep love in his heart he felt our sufferings, and like a sunbeam from a mystic world attempted to warm us up. With pen and word, through work and prayers, he struggled for the Magyar Reformed Church. It was indeed a glad day for him when he was among us, or heard good news of us. His countenance is engraved on our hearts forever. We bless God for sending this great servant to us. His spirit will live with us forever.

Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord from henceforth: yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors; for their works follow with them.—Rev. 14:13."

He won this place of distinction among the Churches of the world through long personal fellowship with their leading ministers, teachers, and officers, through more or less frequent attendance at meetings of their judicatories or at interdenominational assemblies, and above all through his unstinted labors to help those who, through the vicissitudes of war, were brought into dire need. His life was rich both in practical activities and in literary work.

His ancestral heritage for several centuries clearly had much to do with the character of his work. He was of German descent. His forebears in Europe and in America were members of the Reformed Church. The more prominent among them were ministers and teachers. Jacob Guth came to this country from Zweibrücken, Germany, landing at Philadelphia, September 9, 1765. He served as parochial schoolmaster in the Bern Reformed Church, near Reading, Pa. In the absence of the minister he frequently took charge of the Sunday service. His ministrations were sufficiently satisfactory to attract the attention of the Synod, at whose request he was examined for licensure and ordination. He died, however, before the act was consummated.

Dr. Good's grandfather was elected a member of the legislature of Pennsylvania. Two of his uncles, brothers of his

father, were professors; the one in the Reformed Theological Seminary at Tiffin, Ohio, and the other in Heidelberg College located at the same place. His father was a minister of the Reformed Church, principal, also, of a select school for girls, and the first superintendent of Public Schools of Berks County, Pa. With a racial and religious background like this it was no more than natural that Dr. Good by birth, vocation, and choice spent his life in the ministry and the schools of the Reformed Church. In his early manhood his desire to gather information about his ancestors in the Rhine Land was the reason for his first journey to Europe, which in turn awakened a life-long interest in the history of the Church of his fathers—the Reformed Church in Germany and the Reformed Church in the United States.

Dr. Good was born, December 31, 1850, at York, Pa., while his father was a minister of the Reformed Church in that town. He graduated from Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., in 1872, and from Union Theological Seminary, New York, in 1875. The same year he was licensed to preach the Gospel by Lebanon Classis. He served successively as minister of the following churches: Heidelberg, York, Pa., 1875-7; Heidelberg, Philadelphia, Pa., 1877-90; Calvary, Reading, Pa., 1890-1905.

The scope of his work, even while he was in the active pastorate, was wider than the limits of his parish. On account of his studies in the history of the Reformed Church, which at that time were largely confined to the beginnings of the Reformed Church in Germany, he was selected to teach Church History in Ursinus College; he continued in this work from 1890 to 1903, a period of thirteen years. Later he taught Dogmatics and Practical Theology in the same school; and from 1903-7, he was Dean of Ursinus School of Theology. From 1907 until his death he filled the chair of Reformed Church History and Liturgics in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church at Dayton, Ohio. In

recognition of his scholarly attainments he was granted the degree of Doctor of Divinity by Ursinus College and by Lafayette College; later, also, the degree of Doctor of Laws by Ursinus College.

In the course of his active life Dr. Good filled an unusually large number of positions of honor and responsibility. He was president of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Reformed Church in the United States from 1893 to 1924. He was president of the General Synod of the Reformed Church from 1911 to 1913. He was president of the Western Section of the Reformed Alliance; vice-president of the regular sessions of the Alliance which met at Pittsburgh in 1921; vice-president of the Presbyterian Historical Society; president of the American Society of Church History; chairman of the committee appointed by the Reformed Church to publish the English translation of the Latin works of Zwingli. Perhaps the work which appealed to him most and from which he received the deepest joy, was his ministry of aid and cheer to poor and needy Reformed Churches on the Continent of Europe. This ministry fell to his lot as chairman of the Committee on Relations with Churches on the European Continent, appointed by the Western Section of the Alliance of Reformed Churches.

Dr. Good was also an incessant traveler. He went to Europe for the first time in 1879, bent on information about his German ancestors. When he once snuffed the sea air and touched the soil of the Old World, his *Wanderlust* was aroused and never again subsided until he died. He crossed the Atlantic fifty-two times in going to Europe, twenty-six times in as many summers. He also encircled the earth in visiting the missions of the Reformed Church in Japan and in China. In his travels he was a close observer of men and conditions of life. He took delight in meeting men of light and leading especially in religious and educational work. Both his conversation and his public addresses were enriched

by anecdotes and reminiscences drawn from his wide knowledge of men and affairs. I have described at length the salient facts and features of Dr. Good's life, believing that they throw not a little light upon the scope and character of his work as a church historian.

As an historian Dr. Good limited himself to the history of the Reformed Church, and more especially to the Reformed Church in Germany, in German Switzerland, and in the United States. A survey of the books that he wrote shows clearly that he followed a definite plan in his studies and compositions, though he may not have had it in mind when he began his historical investigations. It probably developed as he proceeded in his work. His first published volume was entitled *The Origin of the Reformed Church in Germany*, 1887. This was followed in 1894 by *The History of the Reformed Church of Germany, 1620-1890.* Then came, at longer or shorter intervals, *A History of the Reformed Church in the United States, 1725-1792*, in 1899; *A History of the Reformed Church in the United States in the Nineteenth Century*, in 1911; *A History of the Swiss Reformed Church since the Reformation*, in 1913. These volumes I consider his major historical writings.

His numerous other books, pamphlets, and articles were more or less directly related to the history of the Reformed Church and, in part at least they were a by-product of his researches for the preparation of the larger volumes. Among the minor writings were the following: *Rambles Round Reformed Lands*, 1889; *Famous Places of the Reformed Churches*, 1910; *Famous Women of the Reformed Church*, 1901; *Famous Missionaries of the Reformed Church*, 1903; a pamphlet, *Early Fathers of the Reformed Church*, 1897; a pamphlet, *Historical Handbook of the Reformed Church*, 1897; *Life of Reverend Benjamin Schneider, D.D.*, 1908; a pamphlet, *The Heidelberg Catechism in Picture and Story*, 1913; *The Heidelberg Catechism in its Newest Light*, 1914; *Aid to the*

Heidelberg Catechism, 1904; *Historic Hints and Helps on the Heidelberg Catechism*, 1913; *Famous Reformers of the Reformed and Presbyterian Churches*, 1917; *The Reformed Reformation*, 1916; a pamphlet, *Reformation Hymns of the Reformed Church*, 1917.

The above list contains titles of five major works and of fourteen minor books and pamphlets. Besides these, he wrote numerous articles for weekly, monthly, and quarterly periodicals, which, if collected and bound would add several bulky volumes of miscellaneous writings to those already named. He was manifestly an indefatigable worker with his pen, always gathering material for his books in American and European libraries. Yet, at the same time, with unabated zeal he was active in various forms of the practical work of the Churches in this country and in Europe. These activities alone would have consumed the time and energy of the average man.

In evaluating his historical works we are compelled to answer several questions: First, To what extent do his books cover ground and meet a need that had not previously been covered or met? Second, What new material did he bring to light through his investigations? Third, What was his spirit and viewpoint as an historian?

In answer to the first question I should say that Dr. Good was the first one in America to write in English a history of the Reformed Church in Germany and in Switzerland, for that group in this country who trace their lineage to the lands of the Rhine and the Alps. In this way he helped to keep alive the feeling of fellowship between kindred Churches of two continents and to preserve in America precious racial and religious traditions of one of the original Churches of the Reformation. His popular style of writing, easily read and understood by the average layman, lent itself to the fulfilment of this purpose.

In Germany and Switzerland, of course, men have

written on the history of the Reformed Church in a far more exhaustive and scholarly way. We need mention only the classic by Max Goebel, in three volumes, entitled, *Geschichte des christlichen Lebens in der rheinisch-westphälischen Kirche;* Dr. E. Bloesch's *Geschichte der Schweitzerisch-Reformirten Kirchen*, two volumes; and W. Hadorn's *Kirchengeschichte der reformirten Schweitz.* These works, however, are written in German and in a style that would not appeal to the great majority of readers for whom Dr. Good wrote. His books will doubtless be consulted for years to come by those who are interested in the history of the Reformed Church in Europe, and who, through lack of ability or time, are not disposed to read the larger German works.

The second question is more significant than the first: To what extent did Dr. Good discover new sources and incorporate his findings in his histories?

He was always an indefatigable collector of books, pamphlets, and manuscripts, and in this way he rendered his greatest service. In his frequent journeys to Europe he was not a mere pleasure-seeker; but as a rule, he had a definite historical or beneficent purpose in view. He ransacked the libraries, the book-shops, and the historical archives of Germany, Switzerland, Holland, France, and England, for material relating to the history of the Reformed Church. He gathered a large and varied collection of historical pictures, symbols, emblems, curios, some of which he used to illustrate his narratives. At the time of his death, he owned one of the largest libraries of Reformed books, pamphlets, and manuscripts in America, if not in the world. It is now in the possession of the Theological Seminary at Dayton, Ohio.

In 1896 he found, in the archives of the General Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church at the Hague, several bound volumes of documents from Pennsylvania and a large bundle of letters. These turned out to be an invaluable and indis-

pensable source for an accurate history of the Reformed Church in the United States in the eighteenth century. In the bound volumes and among the letters were found the *Minutes of the Coetus of the German Reformed Congregations in Pennsylvania*, 1747-1792. The letters were from ministers and officers of the Coetus written to the Fathers in Holland during the coetal period. Most of this material had not been accessible to the writers of Reformed Church history before Dr. Good's time.

To copy these manuscripts he procured one of his former students, who at the time was a young teacher in Ursinus School of Theology at Philadelphia, Pa., and who now is Professor of Semitic Languages and Religions at Auburn Theological Seminary, Professor William J. Hinke. Dr. Hinke spent the summers of 1897 and 1898 in The Hague, during which time he transcribed four thousand pages and photographed one thousand documents. In a recent article Professor Hinke said that in this way he "was first attracted to and interested in Reformed Church history." Indeed, if Dr. Good had done no more than to have discovered Dr. Hinke, his labors would not have been wholly in vain in the Lord. Through the joint work of these two men, historical data were made available which made it both possible and necessary to rewrite the history of the Reformed Church in the United States in the colonial and early national periods, based not now upon the uncertain oral traditions of the pioneers and their descendants, but upon indisputable facts of contemporary documents.

These and other sources, relating to Reformed Church history in America and found by him in the historical archives of Germany and Switzerland, Dr. Good used in the preparation of his *History of the Reformed Church in the United States, 1725-1792*. For the first time he made use of original sources, many of them in manuscript, rather than of printed books upon which he depended in the prepara-

tions of his earlier histories. Of this work Dr. Hinke says:

> Equipped with these new sources the author was enabled to virtually rewrite the whole of our early history, basing himself not on uncertain family traditions, but on contemporaneous documents. The book revealed the direction of the Church of Holland in its missionary operations in Pennsylvania more clearly than ever before. The exact number of missionaries sent from Holland was ascertained, namely thirty-seven, as well as the exact number received by the Coetus of Pennsylvania, namely twenty-seven, so that the whole number of members of the Coetus was ascertained to be sixty-four. Besides, the author was also able to throw a good deal of light on the independent Reformed ministers, of whom he presented thirty-seven sketches. Thus he increased not only the total number of known Reformed ministers, who labored in the American colonies during the Coetus period, but he added also many important details to their biographies. The result of this investigation was that the broad outlines of Reformed history in Pennsylvania were clearly sketched. (*The Reformed Church Review*, April, 1924, pp.161-2.)

The weightiest volume that came from Dr. Good's hands was the *History of the Reformed Church in the United States in the Nineteenth Century*, published in 1911. Here he worked in an undeveloped field; for none of the preceding historians of his Church had given more than brief paragraphs or chapters to this period. The author accumulated a truly massive amount of material from widely scattered sources. He gathered data from weekly church papers, monthly and quarterly periodicals, controversial tracts, minutes of classes and synods, pamphlets and books. With much labor he collected and transcribed the manuscript minutes of the eight original classes of the Church, none of which had been used to any extent as historical sources. More than in his previous books, he cites references and quotes at length from his sources. This book of 662

pages, however much men may differ on many of his interpretations of points long in controversy in the Reformed Church, will furnish a vast amount of hitherto unknown information and will be of value to the scholar and the general reader.

The question of greatest import has to do with the spirit and viewpoint of Dr. Good as an historian; for these determine the quality of his constructive work.

Dr. Good was an avowed conservative in theology and an ardent champion of the old and original Reformed faith as held by the Fathers in the sixteenth century. He believed about as firmly in the infallibility of the Heidelberg Catechism as in the infallibility of the Bible. For him the former was a concise statement of the saving truth revealed in the latter. He had no sympathy for any form of modernism. Of progressive revelation, historical development, evolution, divine immanence, and a social gospel, he had no thought, save to condemn them as sceptical innovations and evidences of decadent faith. His was a static universe with a static God working in a miraculous way. The kind of history one, with such an attitude and viewpoint, will write it is not necessary to define in this presence.

Moreover, Dr. Good was the last prominent leader of a party in the Reformed Church, known as the low church or anti-liturgical party. This group and their opponents, the high church and liturgical party, were in bitter controversy for about thirty years. The controversy was dying out when Dr. Good entered the ministry, but he was none the less the heir of its effects and his whole life was controlled and colored by it. In writing his histories he was ever on the alert to prove that the high church party was in the wrong, for no other reason than that it had forsaken the old Reformed way in worship, in polity, and in doctrine. He considered the liturgical movements, once led by men like Dr. Philip Schaff and Dr. John W. Nevin, as a betrayal of

Calvinism in favor of Lutheranism, Anglicanism, or Roman Catholicism. It may be conceded that in some of his contentions he was supported by the evidence of history. Yet such a concession does not change the fact that he wrote history with a controversial spirit, to prove a thesis or to buttress a system.

A witty English critic once remarked of Mitford that he had all the qualifications of an historian—violent partiality and extreme wrath. In that sense, if in no other, we may perhaps all qualify as historians. If one would omit the adjectives, "violent" and "extreme," the remark of the English critic might apply to Dr. Good. He could never quite divest himself of his heritage and rise above the plane of controversy; and in this spirit and with this viewpoint his histories were written.

Dr. Good's strength as an historian was his patient perseverance in the accumulation of data, the collection of books, pamphlets, and manuscripts which were hitherto unknown to the American historian, and also the popular presentation of the history of the Reformed Church, without the slightest attempt at a philosophical interpretation of the relation of the movements in thought and action of his Church to the larger and deeper life of the modern age. Notwithstanding his limitations, the work of his successors will be made easier by his labors, and the historians of American Christianity will always be his debtors.

The Present Status of Slavic Studies in Church History

By
Matthew Spinka

THE PRESENT STATUS OF SLAVIC STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY

By the Rev. Matthew Spinka, Ph.D., Lecturer on Eastern Church History, the Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.

(*Read at the Chicago Meeting, June 19, 1925*)

THERE was a time when it was customary to divide religion into two simple categories: the true and the false. The true was wholly true, the false was wholly false. There were no other colors but white and black: gradations of greys from black to white did not exist at all. More than that: it was not Christianity as a whole that was true, but generally only the particular denominational brand which the individual in question professed. Christians who differed in almost everything else, were unanimous in dubbing all but their own views false. But since the days of Schleiermacher, who abandoned both the wooden rationalism as well as the ossified orthodoxy of the eighteenth century, and defined religion as the feeling of dependence, it was found increasingly difficult to deny a genuinely religious character to other than the Christian religion. To-day students of comparative religion, and the majority of thoughtful Christians as well, treat Christianity as but one among many other religious developments, conditioned by different historical environments and at different stages of moral and religious evolution. Such pitiful provincialism as was customary a century ago is unthinkable among educated Christians to-day; we are thinking of religion in terms of world-wide, all-embracing, general concepts, in which the faiths of mankind are accorded their due consideration.

But this all-inclusive, world point of view, this chief mark of a world Christian, has not become—it seems to me—fully acclimatized in the realm of the history of the Christian Church. To be sure, our standard textbooks are no longer written from a narrowly denominational point of view, even though now and then one finds it comparatively easy to determine the denominational affiliation of the author by the partiality which he betrays in the selection and relative proportion of his materials. But aside from that, these textbooks reveal, unfortunately, a stage of development which, it must be confessed, is still provincial, or partial to the Occidental lands: there is still lack of a broad, truly catholic, all-inclusive, and properly proportioned treatment of the Church as a whole. When we speak so glibly about "Christianity," we often forget that properly understood there is no such thing, but that there exist only the various "Christianities," different and often mutually exclusive or at least conflicting concepts and historically conditioned organizations, and that it would be unjust as well as unhistorical to exclude any constituent part from a proper and due consideration. Practically all our textbooks are written, not about "the Christian Church" as their titles misleadingly profess, but at the best about the Western Christendom, leaving its third main constituent part—the Eastern Orthodox Churches—almost entirely out of their scope. Down to the Seventh General Council (787) one finds a comparatively full and adequate treatment of the Eastern Christendom; but after that date, to judge from the silence of the textbooks, one would hardly suspect that there is any such thing. In fact, many books broadly hint that there really is nothing more to say. And yet, these Churches comprise, on a professedly conservative estimate, some 120 millions of Christians!

It is my purpose to point out this utterly unjustifiable lack of catholicity and breadth of interest, this provincialism

of church history scholarship in America and England. In case of a Roman Catholic priest one could understand such a position, which for him would at least be logical: since every ecclesiastical organization out of communion with the pope of Rome is either schismatic or heretical, he can logically mean only his own communion when he speaks of the Christian Church. The same, of course, applies to a member of the Eastern Orthodox Church. But when a Protestant, who regards his communion a branch of the Church Universal, forgets himself so far as to speak of the branch as if it were the whole tree, then he is both un-Protestant and illogical. And yet when the average Protestant minister speaks of Christendom, he is, as a rule, consciously thinking at the most of Protestantism and Roman Catholicism only. As for the Eastern Churches, he can not be expected habitually to include them in his considerations, because of his lack of information, or of interest, or both. It is really not his fault at all: his historical studies did not afford him a sufficient basis for an intelligent evaluation, a respectable fund of reliable information regarding their history and tenets, indispensable prerequisites to an intelligent conception of, not to say an appreciative insight into, these Christian bodies. Why, then, this partiality which vitiates a properly balanced treatment of the subject? If the study of church history is valuable at all, why should it not be what it professes to be: the history of the Christian Church, and not merely of its western branches? Such a truly comprehensive study alone can afford our ministry the necessary catholicity of spirit.

But in the present paper I do not propose to deal with this entire subject. For a critical examination, it is advisable to divide it into its natural racial groups: the Slavic and the non-Slavic Orthodox Churches. An overwhelming majority of the membership is found in the first-named group, with which I propose to deal. As for the non-Slavic

Churches, I am obliged to confess my incompetency to pass a critical judgment upon them, by reason of lacking the necessary knowledge of the languages in which their literature is chiefly written. But having once isolated the Slavic group of the Orthodox Churches, we may just as well include in our scope the remaining Slavic non-Orthodox Churches, (*i.e.*, chiefly Roman Catholic and Uniat) consisting of the Churches in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the Croatian part of Yugoslavia. The chief reason for this inclusion is that it unifies the subject of Slavic church history, and that generally speaking all Slavic studies share in varying degrees the neglect pointed out in connection with the Eastern Orthodox Churches.

I wish to make it clear that in my estimate of the status of Slavic studies in church history I have in mind only such material as is available in English, for that alone reflects its true condition in America and England. For even though scholars have access to literature in other languages, such material is not likely to be used by the average student, and consequently it is not likely to become a matter of diffused common knowledge. Moreover, I wish to apply to the material under consideration the same principles of sound, critical scholarship—such as the use of primary sources, a knowledge of all the best literature on the subject, especially the native literature, and the use of critical judgment in selection, proportion, and arrangement—as are applied to other historical studies. I wish to concern myself with the question as to whether our present material dealing with Slavic studies could stand the test which would be imposed on any other piece of historical writing claiming to be scholarly.

Therefore, I invite you to join me in a survey of our standard textbooks for purposes of a concrete analysis of the treatment accorded to the subject under consideration. I shall use only such books as are in more or less general use,

in order that we may gain insight into the average situation. Naturally, I have no way of gauging or estimating such additional lecture-material as might be given in some seminaries to supplement the textbook or to estimate the work in such schools where no textbook is used. But judging from the scanty and not readily accessible material dealing with the subject, I venture to say that such supplementary material would be in most cases of negligible quantity, and consequently the textbooks would truly reflect the actual conditions prevailing in the study of church history practically everywhere. Works dealing with particular eras, monographs, and biographies, will be mentioned in their respective places. For greater convenience, I shall treat the subject by nations.

Examining the treatment accorded the largest Slavic Orthodox Church, that of Russia, which alone comprises some three fourths of the membership of all the Eastern Orthodox Churches put together, we find that that eminently fair and otherwise judiciously impartial historian, the late Professor Williston Walker of Yale,[1] accords the conversion of this great country some thirteen lines, in which he manages to involve himself in two minor inaccuracies; but the chief fault of the entire passage consists in the fact that he wholly follows the uncritical, traditional, legendary account of the conversion of the grand-prince Vladimir, and betrays no trace of acquaintance with the critically historical explanation, such as is, for instance, presented in the standard work on Russian history, that of V. O. Kluchevsky,[2] and especially in that monumental work on the Russian Church by Professor E. Golubinsky of the Moscow Theological Academy.[3] Having converted Russia in this summary fashion, and located

[1] W. Walker, *A History of the Christian Church*, New York, 1919, p. 237.

[2] V. O. Kluchevsky, *A History of Russia*, 3 vols., New York, 1910, v i., ch. i. Cf. my article on the conversion of Russia in *The Journal of Religion*, Jan. 1926

[3] E. Golubinsky, *Istoriya Ruskoy tserkvi*, vol. i, part 1, chp. ii, Moskva, 1901.

the metropolitan see at Moscow, Dr. Walker never mentions the subject of Russian Christianity again.

It is, however, Professor A. H. Newman[1] who takes the palm for treating the subject in the briefest possible manner: for he does not treat it at all! To take up his two rather bulky volumes, and note the profuse detail accorded the numerous Anabaptist celebrities, and the absence of any mention of Russia at all,—a great nation of some hundred or more millions of Christians,[2]—produces a distinct disappointment.

Of the older textbooks, George P. Fisher's[3] has the distinction of giving, proportionately, more space to Slavic material than does any other general work. But his reference to the conversion of Russia also follows the legendary account.[4] Later on Fisher describes the establishment of the Russian patriarchate, the Uniats, and the orthodox confession of Mogila's.[5] He also gives a brief summary of the events from the establishment of the Romanov dynasty to the date of writing.[6] In spite of the inadequacy of his treatment, it is more than other writers give. But all in all, it amounts to a little more than two pages.

Another older writer, Henry C. Sheldon,[7] gives a paragraph to the conversion of Russia, but again its repetition of the legend lessens its value. Later on he describes the Tartar period. In his three volumes dealing with the Modern Church, he gives in three short chapters quite a respectable summary of the modern Russian church history. But his sources were antiquated, and his books are out of print.

[1] A. H. Newman, *A Manual of Church History*. 2 vols.

[2] Statistics dealing with the Russian Christendom are so antiquated, confused, and contradictory, that I do not vouch for their accuracy. Correct modern statistics are not available.

[3] George P. Fisher, *History of The Christian Church*, New York, 1896.

[4] P. 165. [5] P. 413. [6] Pp. 556-558.

[7] Henry C. Sheldon, *History of the Christian Church*, vol. ii, The Mediaeval Church, p. 48, 486 ff.

It may, however, be objected that general textbooks can not be fairly expected to present an adequate treatment of the subject; that such a task belongs to specialized treatises. Although I am not willing fully to grant the justice of such a contention, yet it is, of course, obviously true that specialized studies ought to present a more adequate and reliable treatment of the subject than general textbooks. Do we, then, have such works in English?

I may begin with a writer who pioneered in this field. Dean Arthur P. Stanley, in his *History of the Eastern Church*, published in 1861,[1] gave in the latter part of the work a sketch of the Russian Church. Although Dr. Fortescue's judgment that the book "never was of any value"[2] is by far too strict and harsh, yet, in spite of the proper regard due to him for his daring act of pioneering, it must nevertheless be confessed that his work can hardly be regarded as useful any longer. It was never based on the sources, and where he does use contemporary material, he does so very uncritically. For instance, his treatment of Patriarch Nikon as "a Luther or a Wolsey" is really amusing.[3]

Principal Walter F. Adeney's work on *The Greek and Eastern Churches*,[4] although greatly superior to Stanley's work, is nevertheless open to much the same criticism. One is really not dealing with an independent student of the subject at all, but merely with an industrious collator of excerpts from various books in languages with which he was familiar. But let it be said in defense of Dr. Adeney that it can hardly be expected of any one single scholar to produce a really worthy work dealing with the entire Eastern Church,

[1] Arthur P. Stanley, *Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church*, New York, 1873.

[2] A. Fortescue, *The Orthodox Eastern Church*, xxvii.

[3] Ch. xi; *cf.* with it Conybeare, *Russian Dissenters*, in loco.

[4] Walter F. Adeney, *The Greek and Eastern Churches* (International Theo. Library), New York, 1908.

i.e., comprising both the Slavic and the non-Slavic groups. As it happens, it is the Slavic languages which are invariably neglected, when an English author undertakes the task. So the upshot of the matter usually is that what one reads in the pages of such authors as Dean Stanley and Principal Adeney is good old Muraviev, or the historian of the time of Alexander I, Karamzin, or Rambaud, or Leroy-Beaulieu, or some such earlier writer, interwoven with such stray material as the author has gleaned from various other secondary sources. Neither Stanley nor Adeney knew Russian, and that prevented them from gaining an acquaintance with the wider or more critical Russian scholarship.

Let us pass to the bulky work of the English Roman Catholic scholar, Dr. Adrian Fortescue, entitled *The Orthodox Eastern Church*.[1] If one entertains expectations of finding the long-sought critical presentation of the Russian church history in this work, he is doomed to be sadly disappointed. The book deals chiefly with the history of the Patriarchate of Constantinople and other Greek patriarchates, and even then it concerns itself only with such subjects as would be congenial to Catholics, or which are in controversy between the four Eastern and the Roman patriarchates. Involuntarily one experiences a certain tedium with the everlasting monotony of his justifications or exculpations of the Roman patriarchate in every conceivable squabble. As for the Russian Church, to which some ten pages are devoted, the stereotyped story is repeated without the slightest trace of an independent investigation or originality of treatment. Those who seek information about Russia need not waste their time with this work.

Neither is Donald A. Lowrie's *Light of Russia*[2] what we are looking for. Although a good, readable account, it was not intended to be critical, and the author kept within the

[1] Adrian Fortescue, *The Orthodox Eastern Church*, 3rd. ed., London, 1920.
[2] Donald A. Lowrie, *The Light of Russia*, Prague, 1923.

limits of his intention. The small book of R. F. Bigg-Wither on the Church of Russia[1] hardly deserves a notice. One wonders why the author did not read at least the best on the subject to be found in English. The newest work on subject, H. Y. Reyburn's *Story of the Russian Church*,[2] although in many respects deserving of commendation, was apparently based upon the material to be found in English and French, and gives no evidence of knowledge of the critical Russian works bearing upon the theme.

But how different by contrast is the monograph on the Russian Dissenters[3] by the learned discoverer and editor of the Paulician *Key of Truth*, Frederick C. Conybeare. This excellent work, although "not a work of original research" (Preface), is based throughout on the best Russian material, explaining the Schism not by the insufficient hypothesis of ignorant conservatism of the masses opposed to the corrections of the books of ritual—as is repeatedly attempted by those who possess but superficial knowledge of that eventful epoch—but by pointing out the deep-seated opposition to the centralization of power in the hands of the bureaucratic ecclesiastical government. To read Mr. Conybeare's scholarly book, one realizes how much critical work must yet be done before a really scholarly presentation of the rest of the story of the Russian Church can be obtained. His splendid treatise shows us what can be done; but alas, he is but an honorable exception.

What, then, are the desiderata in the field of Russian church history? As has been repeatedly pointed out, the need is for an application of the same standards to this field as to other scholarly work: a critical use of the primary

[1] Reginald F. Bigg-Wither, *A Short History of the Church in Russia*, London, 1920.

[2] H. Y. Reyburn, *The Story of the Russian Church*, London and New York, 1924.

[3] F. C. Conybeare, *Russian Dissenters* (Harvard Theo. Studies, X), Cambridge, 1921.

sources, and knowledge of modern Russian scholarship. Instead of repeating for ever the views of those few older writers who were fortunate enough to have their works translated into some better known European language, such a new treatment should comprise the best in the entire literature on the subject. For example: Russian scholarship no longer accepts the purely Varangian theory of the rise of the Russian state, nor does it accept the so-called Nestor chronicle as a literary unit, but regards it as composite in character. The conversion of Vladimir (987) is explained by the influence of native Christianity, and his siege of Kherson as prompted by his desire to align himself with the Greek court by marriage with the imperial princess Anna. A conscious effort to convert the nation followed two years after Vladimir's own conversion (989).[1]

Critical methods of scholarship must be applied to the rest of the story of the Russian Church, as Mr. Conybeare has done regarding the Schism and the Raskolniki. But besides reworking the materials at hand, there is a great need for additional research which would fill up the numerous gaps and give us a clearer understanding of the various phases of the subject. To mention only one outstanding need along this line: there is no book in English delineating the remarkable development of the philosophical and religious liberal schools of thinkers whose aim was a reinterpretation of the Orthodox Christianity in accordance with modern norms of thinking.[2] Contrary to the popular impression that Russian religious thinking remained stagnant

[1] *Cf.* Kluchevsky, *op. cit.* i, pp. 12-13; *Cambridge Med. Hist.*, iv, ch. vii; A. Beazley, *et al.*, *Russia from the Varangians to the Bolsheviks*, Oxford, 1918, p. 23, and especially E. Golubinsky, *Istoriya Russkoytserkvi*, i, part i, chp. ii, (Moskva, 1901).

[2] The nearest to fulfilling this need comes the really remarkable work of President T. G. Masaryk, *The Spirit of Russia*, London, 1919. *Cf.* my article on the Russian Progressive Religious Thought, in *The Journal of Religion*, Nov., 1926.

for centuries, and that there is really nothing to record, the nineteenth century Russia produced a number of thinkers whose teaching is worthy of study. The conflict of the "Westernizing" thinkers like Chaadaev with the Slavophils, those ardent nationalistic isolationists and zealots for Orthodoxy, like Chomyakov and Kiryeevsky, the small school which developed around the greatest religious philosopher of modern Russia, Vladimir S. Solov'ev, comprising on the one hand men like the two princes Sergei and Eugene Trubetski, and on the other the school of "mystical a-logism", whose chief representatives to-day are Father P. A. Florensky and Professor Sergei N. Bulgakov, all these present material for a study of modern Russian religious movements without which one can not hope to understand the situation. Others also, like the two greatest literary figures in Russia, Theodore M. Dostoevsky and Lev N. Tolstoy, who were no less religious thinkers than great novelists, command our study and attention; of the two, contrary to our Western estimation, Dostoevsky's religious views had immeasurably the greater influence in Russia. V. Rozanov, whom Berdyaev calls "perhaps the most remarkable Russian writer of the last decade"[1] is a disciple of Dostoevsky; so is the philosopher

[1] With the exception of the two last named novelists, most of whose writings have been translated into English, the other religious thinkers have not been so fortunate. But some of Solov'ev's writings have been translated: *The Justification of the Good*, (New York, 1918), and *War, Progress, and the End of History*, (London, 1915). The most important works of Eugene Trubetskoy are: *The World-view of V. S. Solov'ev*, (Mirosozertsanie V. S. Solov'eva 2-vols.); *Liberty and Immortality*, (Svoboda i bezsmertie); and especially *The Meaning of Life*, (Smysl Zhizni, Berlin, 1922). Berdyaev describes the world-view of Dostoevsky in his *Mirosozertsanie Dostoevskago* (Prague, 1923). Works of Dostoevsky have been translated into English, with the possible exception of his *Journal of a Writer*, (Dnevnik pisatelya), in three volumes. The most important of his translated writings is the novel *The Brothers Karamazov*. Of Tolstoy's, *My Confession*, (New York, 1887) and *My Religion*, (New York, 1885) afford an exposition of his religious views. There is a good article, by N. Lossky, on "The Successors of Vladimir Solovyev," in the *Slavonic Review*, June, 1924.

N. A. Berdyaev and the author Merezhkovsky. In distinction from Tolstoy, Dostoevsky is a devout believer in the redemptive mission of the Russian Orthodox Church, and thus he expresses far better than Tolstoy the attitude of the great majority of his compatriots, who regard the Orthodox Church as the purest historical embodiment of the primitive Christianity, and Moscow as the third Rome, *i.e.*, as the heir of the headship and leadership of the Christian world. As a recent Russian writer puts it, the Russian Church "alone having preserved the image of Christ otherwise lost to the world, must bring that word to Europe."[1]

I am fully convinced that a knowledge of the modern Russian religious movements would broaden our outlook upon Christianity as a whole, and their particular contributions would augment the restatement of the eternal verities. Or is "*ex oriente lux*" to-day no longer true?

I am afraid of wearying you by going into a similar amount of detail with the other Slavic nations. Therefore, I shall restrict myself to more general statements. Passing over to the Bulgarian Church, we again find the same summary treatment of mere moments of this nation's history, such as its conversion to Christianity. Moreover, our textbooks without exception repeat a similar story regarding the conversion of the Bulgarian Boris as is current about the Russian Vladimir, and with about as much historical basis.[2] Although none of the Slavic countries compares in importance with that of Russia—with the possible exception of Czechoslovakia because of its cultural influence—yet I think that they are important enough to merit a more extended treatment than they now receive. Only Fisher[3] gives a short

[1] P. Novgorodtsev, *Pravoslavnaya Tserkov*, (The Orthodox Church), in *Russkaya Mysl*, January, 1922, p. 214.

[2] *Cf.* Ferd. Schevill, *The Balkan Peninsula*, New York, 1922, p. 96, for a much more probable and historical explanation of this matter.

[3] Fisher, *op. cit.*, p. 558.

account of the developments since 1890, when Bulgaria became independent of the utterly corrupt rule of the Phanariot officials of the Patriarch of Constantinople. Although the Patriarch refused to acknowledge the new exarch of the independent Bulgarian Church, that official maintains his position to this day. There are only two monographs dealing with this nation's ecclesiastical history: R. von Mach's *The Bulgarian Exarchate*,[1] and an unpublished doctor's thesis of Mr. Victor Sharenkov dealing with Bogomilism in Bulgaria.[2]

The rest of the Balkan Slavs, forming for the greatest part the new kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, were also neglected by church historians. Most textbooks make no mention whatever of these people, neither is the organizer of the Serbian Church, saint Sava (Sabbas) known any better. Barring a few rather unimportant treatises,[3] there is no work in English adequately dealing with the subject. Most of the material with which I am acquainted has a way of being homiletical rather than historical. And yet, there was a time when Serbia was a country of no mean importance: in the fourteenth century, Stephen Dushan, who called himself "emperor of the Serbs, Greeks, and the Bulgarians", wielded a power far greater than that of the degenerate Eastern Empire before his time. Indeed Dushan dreamed of uniting the Serbs, Bulgars, and the Greeks into a great Balkan empire.

Moreover, as even Mr. Conybeare confesses, the accounts concerning the important heretical sect of Bogomiles are "for the most part hopelessly confused and untrustworthy".[4]

[1] R. v. Mach, *The Bulgarian Exarchate*, London, 1909.

[2] At the Columbia University.

[3] Yanich and Hankey, *Lives of the Serbian Saints*, New York. Also F. N. Velimirovich, *Religion and Nationality in Serbia*, London, 1915, (a pamphlet). R. F. Kerner, *Slavic Europe*, which is the most exhaustive bibliography of Slavic historical literature, cites a few others (p. 278).

[4] Conybeare, *The Key of Truth*, Intr., p. cxviii.

Bogomiles spread from Bulgaria all over the Balkan Slavic countries, but became especially important in Bosnia, where "almost the whole nation", as Stanojevic affirms,[1] adhered to the sect, and established a church of their own with a bishop at its head. I have no doubt that a study of the Serbian as well as the Bulgarian sources dealing with this sect would throw a flood of light upon this hitherto obscure subject.

Finally, since the War the new Yugoslav state became one of the most important in the Balkan peninsula. It is bound to exert an increasing amount of influence in the central European as well as the Balkan political world. It seems to me that students of church history would do well to interest themselves in this country even for the sake of its potential importance.

And now, as I explained earlier, I propose to include in our survey two Slavic countries which instead of being predominantly Orthodox, are for the greatest part Catholic: they are Poland and Czechoslovakia. Because of their participation in the general historical movements of Western Europe, their history has been treated with a greater degree of thoroughness, even though one can not speak of scholarly accuracy.

Poland is the less favored of the two; although both suffered comparative neglect because of their long politically unfree status, so that their history was of interest only as it influenced the general movements agitating Western Europe, Poland received even scantier attention than Bohemia. Of the textbooks, Fisher again gives the most extensive, but nevertheless inadequate and none too correct account of Poland. The extension of the Protestant Reformation receives—as can readily be understood—the greatest amount of attention, relatively speaking. Fisher, in his book on *The*

[1] Stanoje Stanojevic, *Dějiny Národa Srbského*, Praha, 1920, p. 168. *Cf.* also A. Denis, *Velké Srbsko*, Praha, p. 100.

Reformation,[1] and Preserved Smith, in his *Age of the Reformation*,[2] give a brief but fair résumé of this eventful period, during which Protestantism was freer in Poland than in any other country in Europe, and had it not been for the unfortunate sectarian antagonisms, bade fair to become the dominant religion of the state. Anti-trinitarianism, not tolerated anywhere else, although severely frowned upon by the other Protestant bodies, was permitted to develop unmolested. Plans for nationalization of the Polish Church, furthered by the nobles, the majority of whom were Protestants, were actually considered, and under the liberally-minded Sigismund Augustus, who himself was leaning toward Protestantism, it seemed for a time that some active steps would be taken in the direction of an essentially anti-Roman settlement of the Polish ecclesiastical affairs. But the unfortunate internal dissensions among the Protestants, coupled with the ceaseless activity of the Jesuits, forfeited this potential Protestant ascendency, and later resulted in the ruin of Polish Protestantism, so that in time it was all but obliterated.

Among the best presentations of this eventful history which has been so far published in English are the works of Count Valerian Krasiński,[3] *Historical Sketch of the Rise, Progress, and Decline of the Reformation in Poland;* and *Sketch of the Religious History of the Slavonic Nations.*[4] The first named two-volume work, although some eighty-five

[1] Fisher, *The Reformation*, New York, 1906, pp. 159-63.

[2] P. Smith, *Age of the Reformation*, New York, 1920, pp. 138-144. As for T. M. Lindsay, *A History of the Reformation*, New York, 1907, 2-vols., this important work gives no account of the Polish Reformation, with the exception of a chapter on Socinianism.

[3] "Krasińskis Werk ist für die Geschichte der polnischen Reformation von geradezu epochemachender Bedeutung" (K. Völker, *Der Protestantismus in Polen*, Leipzig, 1920, p. 195).

[4] Val. Krasiński, *Historical Sketch of the Rise, Progress and Decline of the Reformation in Poland*, 2 vols., London, 1838-1840; *Sketch of the Religious History of the Slavonic Nations*, Edinburgh, 1851.

years old, and consequently lacking the results of the more modern scholarship and investigation, is a very able and valuable piece of work. The latter work, in spite of its title, does not include the history of the Southern Slavs. There is an excellent scholarly modern study by Dr. Paul Fox of the social and economic aspects of the Polish reformation, which deserves a full and hearty commendation.[1]

Unfortunately, interest in Poland seems to have been exhausted by this important period of its history. Having lost its statehood, and in the dismembered condition in which the nation found itself after the partitions, it ceased to interest historians. But Poland was not dead. The outstanding literary leaders of the nineteenth century, Mickiewicz, Stowacki and Krasiński, reinterpreted the tragical facts of their national history in a religiously mystical philosophy of history, akin to that of the Hebrew prophets: Adam Mickiewicz worked out a national Messianic idea, "the glorified conception of Poland redeeming by her suffering, like a modern Christ, the guilt of corrupt European humanity, and thus helping the advent of God's Kingdom on earth,"[2] as Roman Dyboski expresses it. Even though fantastic, this idea became a source of inspiration of a new national life, and this essentially religious ideal played an important part during the period of Poland's enslavement in keeping alive ardent patriotism. Is it any wonder that, nurtured by a religious mysticism so closely bound with patriotism, the Pole became so thoroughly identified with the Roman Catholic Church that he may be compared to an Irishman of

[1] Paul Fox, *The Reformation in Poland*, Johns Hopkins University Studies, Series xlii, No. 4, Baltimore, 1924.

[2] Roman Dyboski, "Literature and National Life in Modern Poland" (in the *Slavonic Review*, June, 1924, p. 120). The "Messianic idea" is best expressed in Mickiewicz's poem "Dziady," found in *Dziela A. Mickiewicza*, vol. iv, Mikolów, 1922. A portion of this poem, under the title "Forefathers' Eve," has been translated into English by Mrs. Radin, in her *Konrad Wallenrod and Other Writings of Adam Mickiewicz*, Berkeley, Cal., 1925.

eastern Europe? The psychology which he developed is similar to that of the Spaniard of the fifteenth century or earlier, with whom fighting for his faith and for his country became synonymous. So the Pole felt obliged to protect himself against the russification policy of the Orthodox Church on the one hand, and against the ruthless germanizing program of the Protestant Prussia on the other. A description of this tenacious, unequal struggle, which would enable us to understand intelligently the sustaining power of Poland's religious life, is still a desideratum.

Czechoslovakia, or more correctly those lands which formerly composed the lands of the Bohemian crown, because of their close and reciprocal relation with the wider European movements, were favored above the rest in the matter of widely diffused, general information concerning their ecclesiastical history. And yet, this knowledge is restricted to particular periods rather than covering the entire range. Between these highly illuminated spots there exist eras plunged into somber shadows or even utter darkness. Due to this fact, even such a well informed and competent historian as Preserved Smith finds it possible to make the astounding assertion that "after various efforts to suppress them (=the Brethren) had failed of large success, the Compacts of 1567 granted toleration to the three principal churches.[1] As a matter of fact, the Compacts referred to are the Compacts granted in 1436 by the Council of Basle to the Utraquists, and they were repealed in 1567 with the full consent of all parties, because they no longer represented the religious demands of the Utraquists or any other party. As for the toleration, that was not really gained until the year 1609.

But passing to an actual examination of the subject, we find that the average church history textbook is quite generous in the matter of giving space to the conversion of the Moravians and the Czechs. The exception of Newman's

[1] P. Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 144.

book, which does not even mention the names of the "apostles of the Slavs", Cyril and Methodius, has already been noted. After converting the Czechs, they are then left alone for some centuries to work out their own salvation. There is really nothing of outstanding importance to record, and the average textbook does well to pass over this period in silence. But with the middle of the fourteenth century, the most important period of Czech history begins with the precursors of John Hus. Of the name and work of this great Bohemian reformer no student of church history can possibly remain in total ignorance, and the textbooks treat the subject well; the only criticism to be found is that they tend to postulate too great a dependence, or practically a slavish subserviency and lack of independent judgment, on the part of the Bohemian Reformer in his relation to Wyclif.[1] After all it must not be

[1] *Cf.* for instance the assertion of Newman, *Manual*, i, p. 616, that "most of his [Hus'] writings are made up almost wholly of excerpts from Wycliffe."

In this Newman quotes Loserth, *Wiclif and Hus*, p. 181, as his authority. But against this minimizing tendency of many German writers, compare what the most scholarly and authoritative of the Czech biographers of Hus, Professor Václav Novotný, of the Charles University of Prague, says in his *M. Jan Hus, Život a Učení*, Praha, 1921, vol. i, part ii, p. 197: "Although dependent upon Wyclif, and although he acknowledges adherence to Wyclif's views—as far as they were domesticated by native developments—even where he does not take them over verbally, Hus never follows Wyclif blindly, does not select indiscriminately, and does not accept tenets without subjecting them to a critical examination. On the contrary, as in Latin writings he never omitted adding a proper modification, so even here (in Exposition of the Faith, a Czech treatise) he does not follow Wyclif wholly, but if on the one hand he is unusually successful in his additions, he likewise, on the other hand, parts company with him wherever he disagrees."

It is significant in this connection to note what Count Lützow says about the same matter in the preface (p. vi) to his *Life and Times of Master John Hus:*

"On the other hand, Protestant German writers have, principally within the last years, violently attacked the memory of Hus. They saw in him mainly the undaunted champion of the oppressed Czech or Bohemian nationality. It was found easier in Germany to render justice to Hus at a time when the national cause for which he struggled so manfully appeared to be doomed, than it is now, when the Bohemian language, which owes so much to Hus, has attained a development that was undreamt of a century ago."

forgotten that in the crucial article of the denial of the dogma of transubstantiation, Hus did not share Wyclif's view, but stoutly maintained the traditional official doctrine to the end. His fully independent thinking is especially to be seen in his Czech writings. Another minor correction might be suggested in this connection regarding the spelling of the name of the reformer with only one "s," as the Czech orthography requires. The Hussite Wars and the rise of the Unity of Brethren is likewise treated quite well, although it ought to be remarked that the commonly asserted statement that the Brethren secured the ordination of their first bishop in apostolic succession from the Waldensian Bishop Stephen, is disproved by the latest investigators.[1] Then our textbooks exhibit an ill-bridged gap till the second half of the sixteenth century, and concern themselves particularly with the causes leading to the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War. From that time onward Bohemia ceases to exist for them.

There is also, comparatively speaking, a wealth of specialized treatises dealing with the various outstanding periods or personalities of Bohemian history. Indeed, the list is so extensive, that all I can do is to mention but a few. The place of honor must be accorded to Count Francis Lützow, a Czech nobleman, who wrote principally upon themes connected with the Czech religious and literary history.[2] On the whole, Dr. Lützow writes as one thoroughly acquainted with both the primary and secondary material

[1] The most scholarly and exhaustive work on the Unity has been recently published by the director of the Herrnhut Archives, Dr. Jos. Theo. Müller. It has been translated into the Czech language by Dr. F. N. Bartoš, under the title: *Dějiny Jednoty Bratrské*, (vol. i, Praha, 1923). It is this work which makes the assertion regarding the ordination of the first bishop of the Unity not in apostolic succession, but presbyterially. *Cf.* pp. 80 ff., and 188. The older legendary account is found in practically all older writers.

[2] A partial list of Count Lützow's works is as follows: *History of Bohemia* (Everyman's Library), London, 1910; *The Life and Times of Master John Hus*, London, 1909; Translation of Comenius's *Labyrinth of the World*, London, 1905; *The Hussite Wars*, London, 1914.

dealing with his subject, so that his works are scholarly and authoritative. They constitute so far the most valuable contribution to the English scholarship in their respective subjects.

Of the rest of the voluminous literature dealing with this phase,[1] I shall mention only the American contributors: Professor David S. Schaff published a biography, *John Huss*,[2] as well as a translation of the chief work of Hus, *De Ecclesia*.[3] Professor W. N. Schwarze also contributed a popularly written study, entitled *John Hus, the Martyr of Bohemia*.[4] An older American production is Ezra H. Gillett's *Life and Times of John Huss*.[5] The Unity of Brethren quite fittingly found its American historian in the Moravian bishop, Dr. Edmund de Schweinitz, whose work, *History of the Church Known as the Unitas Fratrum*,[6] has been largely superseded by the newest and by far the most scholarly work of Dr. Jos. Theo. Müller of Herrnhut, who made use of all the available sources, which had not been accessible to Dr. de Schweinitz.

The other great figure in the Bohemian history, John Amos Comenius, also found a number of biographers, although most of them treated only one phase of his activity, namely, his pedagogical reforms, to the exclusion of everything else. The best known of these works is Will. S. Monroe's *Comenius and the Beginnings of Educational Reform*.[7] As the title indicates, this work largely leaves out his religious and irenic labors.[8]

[1] Enumerated in T. Čapek: *Bohemian [Czech] Bibliography*, New York, 1918, pp. 108-127.

[2] New York, 1915.

[3] New York, 1915.

[4] New York, 1915.

[5] 2 vols., Boston, 1863-64.

[6] Bethlehem, Pa., 1885.

[7] New York, 1907.

[8] I may be permitted to remark that I have worked out the hitherto neglected aspect of Comenius' life, his irenic labors, in my doctor's thesis, under the title: *The Irenic Plan and Activity of John Amos Comenius*. The work is deposited in the University of Chicago Library. A brief summary of this work appeared in the Oct., 1923, issue of *The Christian Union Quarterly*. The only fully exhaustive bibliography of the entire subject of Bohemian history is Č. Zibrt,

From the fateful defeat of the Bohemians in the battle of the White Mountain (1620) to the present day, there is scarcely any English literature, worth mentioning, dealing with the period. The winning of the Czechoslovak independence brought about such important and remarkable religious changes, that on the one hand they led to an unprecedented increase of the Protestant numbers, and on the other resulted in the founding of a strongly anti-Roman, but nevertheless a Catholic national church,[1] that this new Republic is next to Russia the center of present day interest. As an independent and by no means the least important constituent part of central Europe, and because of its high culture the intellectual leader of a large section of other Slavic nations, Czechoslovakia, with its religious history, should receive a greater share of our study and interest.

I have purposely selected such examples as I have adduced from the study of the various living Slavic nations, for the reason that the importance of such a study may be more easily appreciated. But I did not mean to suggest thereby that Slavic studies dealing with groups which have not succeeded in perpetuating their corporate existence by reason of too strenuous a process of "conversion" resorted to by the Germans, or of which only insignificant remnants persist, have nothing to contribute toward the sum total of historical knowledge. An example may be found in two studies by James W. Thompson of the University of Chicago, dealing with "The German Church and the Conversion of the Baltic Slavs,"[2] and the "East German Colonization in the Middle

---

Bibliographie České Historie, of which the fifth volume, (in three parts) deals with Comenius. (Praha, 1910-12). *Cf.* also R. J. Kerner, *Slavic Europe*, Cambridge, 1918.

[1] *Cf.* my article "Religious Movements in Czechoslovakia," in *The Journal of Religion*, Nov., 1923.

[2] *The American Journal of Theology*, vol. xx.

Ages."[1] There are likewise possibilities of discovery of documents of great historical value in the various source materials now buried in the Church Slavonic language which have not been adequately and exhaustively investigated.

Having surveyed—even though but briefly and somewhat superficially, it is true—the present status of Slavic church history available in English, I ask can we regard this situation as satisfactory? Is the material we possess sufficient? Is it scholarly enough to bear the test imposed upon all historical writings claiming our trust and confidence? Barring the few excellent pieces of work which I mentioned, it seems to me that none other than a negative answer is possible. In the majority of instances, the material available was found uncritical, or not sufficiently scholarly in character, based upon antiquated or insufficient secondary material, and in some cases there were serious gaps in the treatment. In other instances, there was lack of any kind of material whatever. Only a few works are really worthy of full commendation.

But are these studies of sufficient importance to warrant specialization in them, and the expenditure of the necessary time and space? To raise such a question is really to raise the problem of which I have already spoken: should we include Eastern Christendom within the scope of our general church history study? But to ask this question is to answer it. Any other but an affirmative answer would convict us of the lack of a truly Christian world-view and catholic sympathies, of a narrow particularism or denominational or racial bigotry, of setting up a kind of a historical K. K. K. platform, or of an arrogant snobbishness of ecclesiastical Nordics. Let me repeat again that no one can understand the Christian Church properly and comprehensively who leaves out of account an entire third constituent part of it—the Eastern Orthodox Churches, of which the Slavic auto-

[1] *American Hist. Association Report*, 1915, pp. 123-150.

cephalous national Churches form an overwhelming majority. So that in the final analysis the task again reduces itseld to a specialized Slavic research.

Secondly, since the Great War, the importance of the Slavic nations has been considerably enhanced, because of the restoration to statehood of two of them—Czechoslovakia and Poland—and the very considerable expansion of Yugoslavia, as well as the changes of fundamental importance which took place in Russia. General historians were not slow to perceive the greatly enhanced importance of Slavic studies, and their awakened interest found a concrete expression in the organization of the School of Slavonic Studies, in connection with the King's College of the University of London. This School is under the direction of Professor Sir Bernard Pares, and has on its faculty such distinguished scholars as Professor R. W. Seton-Watson, a writer of high repute on questions connected with the Slavic nations of central Europe. The School published the best Slavic periodical in English, *The Slavonic Review*, and has recently extended its sphere of co-operation to America. There is an increasing number of American scholars who are devoting themselves to Slavic research. With this awakened interest in Slavic studies both in England and in America, should church history scholars remain behind, satisfied with the meagre and inadequate material at their disposal?

In view of the foregoing considerations, permit me to suggest respectfully and urge most energetically the following propositions:

1. That realizing the importance of Slavic church history, and the inadequacy of the material at present at our disposal, we no longer be satisfied to acquiesce in such a condition of affairs, but seek to rectify the matter. First of all, we must seek to develop specialists who would devote themselves to this neglected field; some larger university

might even establish a chair or a research fellowship for the purpose, but above all, provide funds for a truly adequate library in which literature of the various Slavic nations dealing with the subject could be collected.[1] At any rate, before anything worth while could be accomplished along this line, scholars must be convinced of the necessity and importance of such specialization, and a number of them must be willing to devote themselves to the task.

2. It is only then that we may look to these Slavicists for a serious and scholarly research which would hold equal rank with the work done in other phases of church history. Only men conversant with the languages and the entire field of literature bearing on the subject are competent to remedy the present situation.

3. Our textbooks and lectures must then incorporate this material in such a proportion as could be expected to afford the student an intelligent comprehension and a sympathetic understanding of the historic claims and position occupied by these Churches in the history of the Church Catholic. Finally, an elective or two might be offered for those who should desire to pursue the study further.

[1] Since this paper was read, I have found in the Library of Congress a most excellent collection of Russian books, comprising some 120,000 volumes. Several thousand of these deal with Russian church history. This is the largest collection in America known to me.

The Bellarmine-Jefferson Legend and the Declaration of Independence

By
David S. Schaff

THE BELLARMINE-JEFFERSON LEGEND AND THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

By Professor David S. Schaff, D.D. Recently Professor of Church History in the Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburg. Now Lecturer on American Church History and the Relations of Romanism and Protestantism in Union Theological Seminary, New York

(*Read December 27, 1926*)

THE Bellarmine-Jefferson legend dates from the article of Mr. Gaillard Hunt, entitled "Cardinal Bellarmine and the Virginia Bill of Rights," which appeared in the *Catholic Historical Review*, October, 1917, pp. 276–289. The article sets forth that Jefferson was indebted to Cardinal Bellarmine for the principles of democratic government embodied in the Declaration of Independence, and also embodied in the Virginia Bill of Rights. The alleged discovery seems now to be accepted in Roman Catholic periodicals as a fixed fact. Mr. Hunt's article, which was also issued in separate form, demands attention from the position which Mr. Hunt occupied as chief of the Division of Manuscripts in the Congressional Library at Washington and for his *Life of Madison* and other works. He was a convert to the Roman Church. He died in 1924. All subsequent treatments of the Bellarmine-Jefferson theory start with Mr. Hunt's assertions.[1]

[1] Cardinal Bellarmine died 1621. His observations on civil government are contained in his great work combating Protestantism, *Disputationes de controversiis religionis christianæ fidei adversus hæreticos.* The cardinal was pronounced venerable in 1923.

The object of this paper is to show that the theory is a legend unsupported by a single testimony on the part of those originally concerned with the national documents and is based upon a sheer recent conjecture; that Cardinal Bellarmine's theory of government and the declaration of our liberties differ in essential particulars; and also that the natural origin of Mr. Jefferson's views is a theory as old as Aristotle, as the theory was modified and developed by Genevan, British and American writers, and influenced by the facts of American colonial history.

I. *The Legend Stated.*—As stated by Mr. Hunt, the legend runs thus: Jefferson had in his library a copy of Sir Robert Filmer's *Patriarcha or the Natural Power of Kings*, published in 1680,—an extravagant panegyric of monarchy as the divinely appointed form of government.[1] Filmer has two paragraphs in which he epitomized Bellarmine's theory of the state. It may be fairly presumed that Mr. Jefferson read Filmer's work, although he nowhere mentions the British author. Upon the premise that Jefferson actually read Filmer, Mr. Hunt proceeds to say, that

> students of government like Mason and Jefferson could not have missed the cardinal. There was his name staring at them, not only in Filmer's epitome but in the open sentences of Sidney and Locke and scattered through the later pages of Sidney and Locke. Mason and Jefferson must have had the curiosity to look into the author whom their favorites [Sidney and Locke] so lustily and so continuously abused.

Still again, Mr. Hunt observes that Filmer's epitome of Bellarmine's doctrine "seems to have lodged in Mason's

[1] The copy of Filmer's *Patriarcha* in Mr. Jefferson's library is bound in one volume with Filmer's *Observations Concerning Various Forms of Government*, London, 1696. The observations are a collection of tracts which the author directed against Philip Hunton, Hobbes, Milton and Grotius and are several times the size of the *Patriarcha*. If Jefferson had read the *Patriarcha* it is fair to suppose he also read the Observations. Hunton, one of Cromwell's adherents, wrote a treatise on monarchy, 1643.

and Jefferson's memory to reappear in a new form in the declarations which they wrote." To follow further the author's treatment, it acknowledges that Jefferson nowhere in explicit statement gives a hint that he was indebted to Bellarmine or that he had looked into Bellarmine's treatise.

The position, thus taken, is strengthened by the supposed or real acquaintance which Mr. Madison had with the cardinal's work. As a student in Princeton, Mr. Hunt continues, this other founder of the Republic who was "also a student of politics and accustomed at this period of his life to read everything he could lay his hands on," must have read Bellarmine. A copy of the cardinal's work was at that time in the Princeton library. Moreover in the list of books on theology which, at Jefferson's request, Madison sent to Jefferson in 1824, Bellarmine's name was given.

The object which Mr. Hunt had in view in his article was, to use his own words, "to discover what was the immediate source of that part of the Virginia Bill of Rights and the Declaration of Independence which proclaimed the natural equality of man and that the right of governing is from the people." In closing his article Mr. Hunt says:

> Did the Americans realize that they were staking their lives in support of a theory of government which has come down to them from a Catholic priest? We cannot answer. But it should be a satisfaction to Catholics to know that the fundamental pronouncements upon which was built the greatest of modern revolutions found their best support in the writings of a prince of the church.

In considering these statements the following things are first to be noted: 1. The copy of Filmer in Jefferson's library in Washington bears no marks of having been reread or studiously read. A pencil mark now drawn at the side of one of its paragraphs is evidently fresh. It is not im-

probable that Mr. Hunt himself drew the line inasmuch as it is one of the two passages which he quotes in his article. 2. The copy of Bellarmine which, according to the catalogue of 1760, was in the Princeton library when Madison was a student in the college, was destroyed by fire in 1802 with other books of the college library.[1] 3. Bellarmine's name is not, as alleged, scattered widely in the writings of Sidney and Locke. In Locke's treatises it is simply mentioned in the compass of three or four lines. Sidney, in his work of 500 pages, mentions the cardinal eight times and declares that he had not read his great treatise. It is true that on one occasion he says "we will stand with Buchanan, Calvin and Bellarmine." On the other hand, he acknowledges a special dependence upon Calvin in such passages as this: "We prefer to follow Calvin's opinion."—I:9. 4. In regard to a statement made by Mr. Hunt that "old Protestant ministers remember, when they studied divinity at the Episcopal High School near Alexandria, Va., that they heard Bellarmine quoted," it is to be remarked that William and Mary College, the oldest literary institution of Virginia, does not now and never did possess a copy of Bellarmine's work, that the University of Virginia has never been in possession of it and that the venerable Theological Seminary of Virginia at Alexandria, Virginia, likewise has never had a copy of the work. The same is true of the library of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary at Richmond, Virginia. It is a fair presumption that, if copies of Bellarmine had been in the libraries of early Virginia clergymen, some of the copies would certainly have found

[1] Among the works in the original Princeton collection were Aristotle, Buchanan, Milton, Puffendorf, Sidney and Locke, as well as Thomas Aquinas, Wyclif, Calvin, Augustine and Rutherfurd. The librarian of the University of Virginia, Dr. Patton, informs me that "there is in the library a manuscript list of books proposed to be purchased by the library dated 1825. It contains the entry *Bellarmini opera*, but the catalogue of 1828 does not contain the work."

their way into the libraries of these institutions. 5. In looking through Filmer it is to be noted that, while he gives an epitome of Bellarmine, he states that the democratic doctrine which he was opposing was also held in the Reformed Churches. His words are that the theory "was first hatched in the schools and has been fostered by all succeeding papists for good divinity and that the divines also of the Reformed Churches have entertained it." The common people, he adds, "tenderly everywhere embrace the view, for it properly distributes a portion of liberty to the meanest of the multitude who magnify liberty, never remembering that liberty was the first cause of the fall of Adam." Again, this author informs us that his own view of the proper seat of liberty is expressed in the sentence "the greatest liberty is for a people to live under a monarch."

It was not long till Mr. Hunt's alleged discovery was taken up by other Roman Catholic writers who have treated it as historical fact. The periodical *America*, May 19, 1923, said that in the cardinal

> democracy has one of the clearest and most logical exponents and Americans have every reason to honor his writings as one of the sources from which Jefferson, who knew them from notices derived from others, drew some of the fundamental principles of the Declaration of Independence.

A writer in the *Catholic Historical Review*, accepting outright Jefferson's indebtedness to Bellarmine as proved, states: "that the cardinal's contribution to democracy is attested by the principles enunciated by him which were incorporated in the Declaration of Independence."

Dr. John C. Rager in the *Catholic Historical Review*, January, 1925, pp. 504–515, under the heading "The Blessed Cardinal Bellarmine's Defense of Popular Government in the 16th Century" went, if possible, further and declared that the cardinal set forth

the very principles which the modern world prizes so highly as the foundation of popular and democratic government and which have procured for millions the pursuit of life, liberty and happiness. This Catholic priest, 300 years ago, in unfaltering terms defined the origin and obligation of kings and laid down the principles of civil and individual liberty.

The writer suggests that as a champion defending popular liberty, the cardinal stepped forth into the arena of his time like another John the Baptist or Ambrose. Further, as for the immediate bearing of the cardinal's discussion upon the Declaration of Independence, Dr. Rager said: "It is interesting to note how often his political ideas coincide with the Constitution and principle of our own American government, based on federal and state rights." As we shall see, Bellarmine has not the remotest reference anywhere to federal and state rights. In concluding, Dr. Rager writes that

the general conclusion is that the all-pervading idea in Cardinal Bellarmine's philosophy was one of popular government. He defended the world against the encroachments of absolute monarchy, and the principles which a few centuries later were embodied in all modern refined and well organized democratic governments. . . . It seems very plausible that Jefferson if he read between the first pages of Filmer's *Patriarcha*, derived from Bellarmine the wording and thoughts of a number of clauses embodied in the Declaration of Independence.

In the course of his article the writer quotes Professor Alfred O'Rahilly's statement in *Studies*, March, 1918, that "the Declaration is an accurate transcript of the Catholic mind."

Mr. Jefferson's indebtedness to Cardinal Bellarmine is reasserted in the important text-book, *The Church and the State*, issued by Professor Ryan and Millar. In no less than four different places is it dwelt upon.—pp. 114–120, 134–137, 160–165, 172–177. It is hard, the authors affirm,

to avoid the conclusion that with a copy of Filmer in his possession, Jefferson must have included Filmer's summary of Bellarmine among the materials used in the preparation of the Bill of Rights and the Declaration of Independence. If so, the denial of the omnipotence of parliament is no more than a reassertion of Bellarmine's and Suarez's denial of the divine right of kings.

In passing, it is to be noted that Bellarmine says nothing whatever about parliaments and as will be seen asserts a principle of government which has no place for the parliamentary idea. In regard to Sidney and Locke, the textbook takes the position that "neither of them were real thinkers," and moreover that the English writers lost sight of the past as it was embodied in mediæval tradition. It was "mainly on the basis of scholastic philosophy," it adds, that the Whig theory of government was formulated. "The Declaration of Independence was not the assertion of new principles or new arguments. It contains the true mediæval and Christian norm of all just governments."—P. 174. Dr. Ryan is professor of moral theology in the Catholic University in Washington.

Ryan and Millar allege that Hamilton, Wilson and Madison were "in strange agreement in fundamental points with Bellarmine and that all were great readers," and say further that all three "seemed to be entirely free of antagonism to the Catholic religion." In another place they add: "that there is every reason to believe that at least Madison and Wilson were acquainted with Bellarmine and Suarez" and they explain the absence of all explicit reference to these writers by the signers of the Virginia document and the signers of the Declaration of Independence, on the ground that in the circumstances of their day it would scarcely have been prudent for them to express obligation to a Roman Catholic authority. Professor Ryan, p. 177, asserts that "the paragraphs of the preamble

of the Bill of Rights, now ascribed to Jefferson, bear a no less striking resemblance to the passage of Filmer epitomizing Cardinal Bellarmine than does the theoretic portion of the Declaration of Independence." Again, the professor of church history in Washington Catholic University, Professor Guilday, in his *Life of John Carroll*, p. 243, confidently carries back the "theory of government enshrined in the Bill of Rights as well as in its subsequent imitation, the Declaration of Independence, to Cardinal Robert Bellarmine."

II. *Bellarmine's Theory of Government.*—What was Bellarmine's theory of government? The cardinal's discussion is carried on in three places,—in his treatments of the Roman Pontiff, *de pont. rom.*, I: g–6, the Clergy, *de clericis*, I–VII, and the Laity, *de laicis*, VI. It is to be noted that the cardinal opens his discussion of civil government by quoting Aristotle. In his treatise on the Roman pontiff, he was concerned to show that the pontiff gets his office and authority immediately from God through St. Peter, and that, by reason of this, in the Church he is supreme, that in matters of faith and morals he is infallible, and also that he exercises, though indirectly, temporal authority,—*papam habere temporalem potestatem indirecte.* In contrast to the immediate appointment of the ecclesiastical office and order by God, the particular form which secular government assumes depends upon the people. Citing Plato and Aristotle for the three forms of government,—monarchy, aristocracy and democracy,—Bellarmine repeatedly expresses his preference for pure monarchy as the best and most excellent form, the form prescribed for the Church with the pope at its head,—*optimum ac præstantissimum regimen.* Although simple and absolute monarchy excels,—*simpliciter et absolute*,—nevertheless in view of the corruption of human nature and in the present time—*hoc tempore*—a mixed form of government is the more useful—

utilius—or, as we might say, the more expedient. The cardinal combats Calvin whom he represented as having "favored states governed by senates and the people, as was Geneva." The argument for monarchy is based upon the following grounds: no single ruler can be everywhere and cover all states in person; monarchy is the most constant and the least given to promote division; it is most adapted to make the commonwealth strong—*fortiorem.* Moreover, it is easier to find one good man to rule than many good men to carry on the government and easier for the people to obey one man than many. Contrasting the stability of monarchy with other forms of civil government, the cardinal reminds us that the Roman government was a republic for 480 years while for the longer time from Julius Cæsar to the fall of Constantinople in 1453 it was a monarchy, that is, 1495 years.

In the mixed government which, in view of the present corruption of nature, Bellarmine recommends, the chief element is monarchy and the least part democracy. At the head of this mixed government stands a supreme ruler or king who rules all and is subject to none—*qui omnibus imperat et nulli subjiciatur.* Under him are rulers of states and provinces who implicitly obey the rule of the supreme ruler and at the same time govern their provinces as if they were their own—*ut propriam suam.* This supreme ruler shall be in power not by right of heredity but by the will of the whole people. Secular government is in the hands of the people unless it is transferred by the people to a ruler,—*in populo nisi a populo transferatur in principem.*

In his treatment in the book on the Clergy, it is again the cardinal's main purpose to impart the principle that ecclesiastical government is not in the assembly of the faithful but in the supreme pontiff—*non est in ipso cœtu fidelium sed in summo pontifice.* On the other hand, in the civil republic all men are born free and on this account the

people itself is the source of political power—*et proinde potestatem politicam immediate ipse populus habet.* However, this right inherent in the people, the cardinal again repeats, lasts only until the people have transferred power to a particular king—*donec eam in regem aliquem non transtulerit.* And, once more, the view is reaffirmed when he says that it is only when there is no ruler that the people have a right to elect a ruler—*populus tum solum potest regem eligere cum rege caret.* Disparaging democracy, the opinion is laid down by the writer that in every state the major part is bad rather than good and the larger number foolish rather than wise. Of all forms of government the democratic form is the worst,—*deterrimum.*[1]

In the book on the Laity the argument is that government or order is of God's appointment. It is a law of nature, and does not exist by the consent of men—*ex consensu hominum.* The particular form or species which human government takes is of the whole people. So far as the subject goes, the law is according to the law of nations —*de jure gentium;* so far as the ruler goes, it follows the divine appointment. In apparent contradiction of himself and referring to the case of Pagan Rome, Bellarmine says that, when a legitimate cause is presented, the multitude may change the kingdom into an aristocracy or a democracy as the Roman people did. In the beginning, rulers and kings got their position by usurpation but, in course of time, they or their successors came to be—*fiunt*—legitimate rulers, by the consent of the people—*ex consensu omnium.*

In brief, the theory expounded by Cardinal Bellarmine

[1] Bellarmine's full statement runs that "it is not credible that Christ, the most wise king, instituted in his church that form of government which of all is the worst and the worst is the democratic form, *deterrimum regimen dimocratiam.*" He represents Calvin as wanting to make out that monarchy is the worst of all governments, *deterrimum omnium vult esse monarchiam.* The cardinal states that he presented the views held by the Genevan Reformer in his earlier period and passed by the views he held after 1559.

is that under present evil conditions, a mixed form of secular government has the preference, a government in which the monarchical element predominates. The head of the government has power by virtue of the original consent of the people or, if he be a usurper, by the acceptance of the people. Once power is accorded to a ruler, the people ceases to have power in itself.

III. *The Natural Origin of Jefferson's Views.* In opposition to the Bellarmine-Jefferson legend, are the facts that there is not a single external testimony for it in the discussions over American Independence, and that it violates the progress of governmental thought which had been going on in England and with which the founders of the Republic were familiar. Further it ignores the atmosphere of American free thought which these founders breathed from their childhood.

1. If we turn to the writings of Jefferson, Madison, Hamilton and Franklin, there is not a single quotation given from Bellarmine. Nor is there a single reference to him as an authority. A bare citation of the cardinal's name is contained in the writings of Madison and that only once. This citation occurs in a list of books for the University of Virginia which Madison sent to Jefferson, September 10, 1824. In August, Mr. Jefferson had requested Madison to make out a list of volumes suitable for the university, "especially writers of celebrity in religious metaphysics, such as Duns Scotus *et alii.*" Not receiving an answer, Jefferson wrote again September 3rd, asking Mr. Madison "to expedite" the transmission of the list "as much as possible." In the list, which Madison sent a week later, he remarked that he had been leisurely at work complying with Jefferson's first request and had made out a catalogue of the writers of the first five Christian centuries and that then he was sending "an addition on the same paper of such works as a hasty glance at a few catalogues and my

recollection suggest." Madison's first list showed careful preparation. It contained in catalogue form fifty-six writers from Clement of Rome to Leo the Great, together with dates of printed editions and included at the side of the Christian writers Philo, Josephus and the Life of Apollonius of Tyana. The additional list, hastily made up, contained sixty-six writers. It starts with the word "Miscellaneous" and the names are given one after the other without break. The first names given are the Koran, Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus, Erasmus, Cave's Lives of the Fathers, d'Ailli, Socinus and Bellarmine. In it are included the French writers, Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Massillon and the Protestant Saurin, but chiefly English writers since the Reformation, such as Chillingworth, Richard Hooker, Whitby, Isaac Newton, on Religious Subjects, King on the Origin of Evil, John Taylor Against Original Sin, Edwards on the Will and Virtue, Wesley on Sin, Butler, Paley and Locke.[1] From this list Ryan and Millar draw the conclusion that Madison having had, as they say, a "deep interest in theological subjects," must have read Bellarmine. Why not on the same principle assert that Madison also read Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus, Philo and all the rest of the authors contained in the list? At this point it is to be noted that Mr. Hunt in his *Life of Madison* published 1902 made no mention of Bellarmine as a part of Madison's training nor did he give a hint that the cardinal influenced the author of the Declaration of Independence.

2. The collegiate education of Jefferson and Madison indicates definitely a different source of political influence from that of Cardinal Bellarmine and those who sympathized with him in matters of religion and civil government. As a student at William and Mary, Jefferson was a warm admirer of his teacher, the Scotchman, Professor William

[1] The correspondence and the list are given by Rives: *Life of Madison*, I: 641–645.

Small, and the professor's intimate companion. To this teacher he gave the testimony in his autobiography as "a man most profound in most of the useful branches of science who made me his daily companion. From his conversation I got my first views of the expansion of science and of the system of things in which we are placed." If these conversations included civil government as with reasonable certainty they did, it should not be forgotten that Small spoke with Knox, the Scotch covenants and Buchanan behind him. Milton, Sidney and Locke had all likewise preceded him. As a Scotchman and with all these writers and Scotch history behind him, it is not likely William Small went to Cardinal Bellarmine for his ideas of government.[1]

As for Mr. Madison and his college training, he was influenced by Dr. Witherspoon, President of Princeton and one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence. In his biography of Madison, Mr. Hunt barely mentioned Dr. Witherspoon and failed to bring the two into close association. On the other hand, Rives dilates upon the students of the college as "animated with a high spirit of public liberty and jealous love for constitutional freedom," and asserts that "such sentiments were breathed into them by their great preceptor." Madison and Dr. Witherspoon had come to Princeton the same year. The president early espoused the growing sentiments of liberty and colonial union of his adopted country. He spoke of the

arbitrary and unconstitutional proceedings of Great Britain, the control of the people in matters of government and the

[1] Dr. Swem, the librarian of William and Mary, writes to the author that "William Small must have been an Episcopalian. At least he signed in the faculty book the statement to the effect that he believed in the XXXIX Articles. Every professor before the Revolution had to sign such a statement." In regard to a statement made by Mr. Hunt that in the pre-Revolution period, "religious controversy raged" in William and Mary, Dr. Swem remarks that "he feels sure that to say religious controversy raged is not correct."

necessity of the colonies proceeding from independence to a confederacy and the separation between Great Britain and America as being in accord with the intention of Providence.

He affirmed that usurped power by king and parliament meant absolute slavery for Americans. He referred to the examples of the free states, Holland and Switzerland. When the plan was sent out from New York that the colonies yield to Great Britain he resisted it. As a member of Congress, he stood beside Adams, Franklin and others for liberty and colonial separation. In Witherspoon's writings the name of Bellarmine seems not to be mentioned. Government and colonial rights, it is fair to suppose, formed a subject of conversation between the eminent president and the enquiring student at Princeton. If this was not the case, the leading subject engaging the minds and discussions of the colonies was left out. The suggestion that young Madison read the copy of Bellarmine on the college shelves of Princeton is a pure surmisal. Madison's intimacy with Dr. Witherspoon is a fact.

3. Jefferson and Madison had behind them a whole galaxy of English writers on government from whom they would naturally get their views, not to speak of Aristotle. Mr. Jefferson's library contained an elaborate list of books on government, including Plato and Aristotle, Machiavelli, Calvin, Richard Hooker, Buchanan, Grotius, Puffendorf, Vattel, Montesquieu, the *Utopia*, Coke—seven volumes—Harrington's *Oceana*, Milton's Prose Works, Sidney, Locke and other writers. In it were volumes of *Tracts on English Politics*, *Parliamentary History*, *Debates on Administration*, *English Liberties*,—issued at Providence, 1774—the *Farmer's Letters*, pamphlets written by Franklin and others bearing immediately on American affairs. All these volumes are of editions issued before 1775 and presumably were among Jefferson's books before that date. Plato's *Republic*

and Machiavelli were represented by translations as well as copies in the original.[1] Copies of Milton, Sidney and Locke were also, as we might expect, in the libraries of Hamilton and Franklin.

Americans were familiar with such authors as Milton, Sidney and Locke. Professor Hart, giving paragraphs from Calvin on Government, remarks that "they were much quoted by the New England ministers and statesmen." The authorities used to inculcate the ideas of civil liberty were enumerated by Dr. Mayhew in his famous sermon preached in Boston, 1756. He said that he had been initiated in youth in the doctrines of civil liberty as they were taught among the ancients and such persons as Milton, Sidney, Locke and Horsley among the moderns. Locke was quoted in the Election sermons delivered in Boston. The charge was made by an English dean that the Protestants of North America preferred to inculcate the principles of Locke over the Gospel in regard to civil government. A contemporary New England print intended to represent the resistance to the imagined attempt to land a bishop in America pictured a ship held off from the shore of Boston over which were hung different banners with such names and phrases as "Locke" "Sidney on government," "Calvin's Works," "Barclay's Apology," "Liberty and Freedom of Conscience." An edition of Locke on Government was printed in Boston, 1773.[2] Mr. Jefferson's testimony to the value of Locke's treatises was explicit. Writing May 30,

[1] Aristotle was represented in Jefferson's library by a Greek and Latin edition of 1597 in 8 volumes, as well as a separate copy of the *Ethics*. A splendid volume giving Ellis' translation bears the date 1778. Jefferson had two copies of Buchanan and two copies of Calvin in French as well as a Latin compilation from Calvin. Among other works were Bodin's *Republic*, *Eikon Basilike* and Witherspoon's writings.

[2] "An Essay concerning the True Original Extent and End of Civil Government by the Late Learned John Locke, Esq." A copy is in the New York Library. The Boston Committee of Correspondence appointed 1772, quoted freely from Locke.

1790, to a young man, Thomas Mann Randolph, who was contemplating the study of law, he referred him to "Locke's little book on government as perfect as far as it goes." Again, twenty years later, June 11th, 1807, giving a list of books on government, he recommended five, Locke and Sidney being given the first place. It is rightly said by Beck, writing of the Constitution, that "behind its framers were the mighty shades of Coke, Hampden, Milton and Locke." So far as Bellarmine's works are concerned, it must be remembered that they were in Latin and a Princeton undergraduate, like Madison, must have been an advanced Latin scholar to have attempted to read an ecclesiastical treatise such as is the cardinal's work on the controversies of the Christian religion.

4. The atmosphere in which Jefferson, Madison and Mason were born and which they willingly breathed in their early years was quick with the spirit of political and individual liberty. New England was aflame with ideas of national independence, as these men must well have known. To the town-meeting of the northern colonies has been ascribed a positive influence in the training of New England men for republican self-government. Jefferson himself declared that he was indebted to the meetings of the church in his neighborhood for some of his best political ideas. Long before the Revolution, Otis had asserted the right of the colonies to legislate through assemblies of their own. It is true that, when Adams charged that the essence of the Declaration was to be found in Otis' speeches and that it contained no new ideas, Jefferson replied that he had never seen them. It was not necessary that he should have read them.[1] The idea of the sovereignty of popular assemblies was in the air. Had not Patrick Henry in Virginia treated government as a conditional compact and

[1] See Jefferson's Works, vii, 305. For Hooker, see collection of the Connecticut Historical Society for 1860, vol. i.

asserting American rights exclaimed, "Give me liberty or give me death"? The pulpits of the northern colonies had with no uncertain sound asserted the rights of the people to resist encroachments from abroad on their liberties —liberties assured to them in the Colonial charters and in their inheritance as Englishmen or the descendants of Englishmen. In a sermon delivered in 1638, the Rev. Thomas Hooker, the founder of Hartford, pronounced the "foundation of authority to be laid firstly in the full consent of the people" and that the people which elects magistrates has the right "to set bounds and limitations of the power and place to which it calls them." In accord with such earlier expressions of political philosophy, the Rev. John Wise, 1652–1725,—referred to recently by Mr. Coolidge as having laid down clearly the principle of human rights,—declared in his notable treatise that "the first human subject and original of civil power is the people" and that "all are naturally free and equal, going about voluntarily to erect themselves into a new commonwealth." A half century later, when the causes which provoked the Revolution grew to be more irritating, the pastors called upon to preach the annual Election sermons in Boston took radical ground. They emphasized compacts and covenants as marking the relations of governors and the governed. The leaders of government in New England were accustomed to the idea of popular authority through the "Church Covenants" of New England. Dr. Cook in 1770 spoke of the reciprocal obligations of the two parties, declared the Massachusetts charter was not an act of grace but a compact and that Sir Edmund Andros had trampled on all the laws and rights of the colony. In his Election sermon of May, 1776, Dr. West called upon the people to offer prayer that God might strengthen the harmony of the United American Colonies and quoted Mr. Locke to the effect that "all men are naturally in a state of perfect freedom to order their

actions without asking leave of any man." As for magistrates, he said that "they are to consider themselves servants of the people" and "when the people feel themselves cruelly oppressed by the mother country, they may throw off the yoke." The year before, Dr. Langdon, president of Harvard College, exclaimed that "it was the great cause of liberty in which the colonies were united" and spoke of the British scheme of taxation as "threatening a final separation of the colonies." He pronounced the right of self-government to be of God and that the divine right of kings was exploded.

The Virginia Bill of Rights laid down the principle that office-holding is a trusteeship when it pronounced "all power to be vested in and derived from the people and that magistrates are their trustees and servants and at all times amenable to them."[1]

If the clergymen of the Established Church in Virginia have left no volume of patriotic sentiments such as issued from the pulpit of Massachusetts, the Baptist and Presbyterian preachers of the southern colony helped materially to promote the spirit of colonial liberty and independence by their clerical activity in defiance of the Virginia laws forbidding all dissent from the Anglican church. Jefferson, recognizing the unfairness of placing dissenters under disabilities, became the author of the law giving full freedom to all Christian bodies and disestablishing the Church of England.

No evidence exists that any of the writers or preachers or officials in New England and Virginia was indebted to Cardinal Bellarmine for his views. Behind Mr. Jefferson and the other signers of the Declaration of Independence

[1] Prof. McLaughlin in his *Steps in the Development of American Democracy*, p. 15, calls attention to the political opinions of Sir Edwin Sandys, one of the leading figures in the early history of Virginia. It was said of him that he declared that "if our God from heaven did constitute and direct a form of government it was that of Geneva."

was a long series of events in American history which led naturally along the path of resistance to arbitrary legislation. It began with the Mayflower compact when the Pilgrims covenanted and combined themselves together into a "civill body politick." The idea of independence on American soil was encouraged by the New England Union of 1643, which provided for assemblies to which four of the colonies were to send representatives. Regicides who had been party to the execution of Charles I were protected on New England soil. The policy, whereby the American colonies joined together in a common cause, found expression from seven out of the thirteen colonies through their representatives at the Albany convention of 1754. This assembly, of which Franklin was the leading genius, proposed to hold conventions every three years and laid down the principle that, subject to the king's veto, the colonies had the right to tax themselves for their protection and other rights. The facts of colonial history during the twenty years before the Declaration was written were a wide-open vestibule to the assertions laid down in that instrument. Such legislation as the Stamp Act and Navigation Acts called forth the native instincts of personal and civil sovereignty throughout the land. If in Massachusetts, when the legislature was dissolved by a royal writ, a new legislature was immediately convened, so also in Virginia an independent legislature sat and acted immediately after the royal dissolution of the House of Burgesses. It is a remarkable fact that the colonies of Massachusetts and Virginia were one in the resistance of foreign encroachment and the assertion of independent rights.[1] The Continental Congress in 1774

[1] Channing in his history states the matter succinctly when he says of the influences which were at work: "American statesmen, Otis, Henry, Gadsden, the Adamses, Dickinson, Jefferson, George Mason and the rest, combined the ideas of Locke with the practical knowledge which they had gained in their careers and enunciated a theory which was incompatible with the ideas of empire then held."

agreed to aid Massachusetts in the hostilities already begun and on June 7th, 1776, Richard Henry Lee offered his resolution that "these United Colonies are and of right ought to be free and independent states." Was Lee also acquainted with Bellarmine's views and dependent upon him? At the same time, news was coming over from England of the insistence upon the constitutional rights of British subjects led by Burke. In the north and in the south the expressions, "no taxation without the consent of the people, voluntary compact, constitutional rights, privileges and liberties" were household words. Such expressions are not to be found in the pages of Cardinal Bellarmine. The impulse to set forth the ideas contained in the Declaration of Independence and the ideas themselves have a sufficient explanation in the events of colonial history.

5. The facts of British history. Behind Mr. Jefferson also were the facts of British history from Magna Charta and Stephen Langton, who incurred the papal disfavor, to 1689. The progress of British practice was in the direction of the rights of the people. Jefferson's generation knew well about the mighty struggle carried on with the Stuarts and the execution of Stafford, Laud and finally the king himself, Charles I, in 1649. The discussions of the Long Parliament which ordered these measures and the Petition of Rights in the Cromwellian period protested against the arbitrary sovereignty of kings and asserted the rights of the people through their representatives. The Bill of Rights adopted after the flight of James II and the elevation of William and Mary was in important respects a forerunner of the American declarations. The events issuing in the enthronement of the Prince of Orange were known as the glorious Revolution.[1] In demanding their liberties,

[1] In its resolution of 1688, parliament declared that James II had "endeavored to subvert the constitution, laws and liberties of the kingdom by

the American colonists knew that they were in line with the aspirations of their forefathers and felt that they were acting as children of England and heirs of its constitutional struggle. There existed no pretext for the signers of the Declaration to go back to Cardinal Bellarmine to learn about popular rights which had been discussed in notable English parliaments and treatises and sealed with English blood. Had they gone to him, they would have failed to find the sentiments with which they burned. Rives is right when he says in his *Life of Madison*, i: 137: "the Virginia Declaration of Rights of 1776 is the extracted essence of the Magna Charta, the Petition of Rights, the acts of the Long Parliament and the doctrines of the Revolution of 1688 as expounded by Locke." When Richard Henry Lee went so far as to make the charge that the Declaration of Independence was copied from Locke's *Treatise on Government*, Jefferson, then advanced in age, replied: "that all the authority of the Declaration rests on the harmonizing sentiments of the day whether expressed in conversation, in letters, printed essays, or in the elementary books of public right as Aristotle, Cicero, Locke, Sidney, etc." What a splendid opportunity these patriots had to mention Bellarmine, had they been indebted to him! In a letter to Madison, Mr. Jefferson further declared that in preparing the Declaration he "turned to neither book nor pamphlet, while writing it, and that he did not consider it as any part of his charge to invent new ideas altogether and to offer no sentiment which had never been expressed before." *Works*, vii, 305, 406, 407.

IV. *Cardinal Bellarmine's Theory of Government Compared with the Declaration of Independence.*—If we compare the positions laid down by the cardinal and the American prin-

assuming power to suspend laws without the consent of parliament," and insisted on "the undoubted rights and liberties" of the people.

ciples of government, it will be found that they are in essential matters disparate.

1. The general position taken by Bellarmine that in the first instance it is for the people to choose their form of government was not original with the cardinal. The principle had been stated at length by Aristotle 2000 years before him and also by a class of writers beginning with Marsiglius of Padua about 1350 and reaching to Calvin and the writers in France and England living in the 16th century, who were disciples of Calvin. With Cardinal Bellarmine monarchy is the ideal government. With these other writers, the ideal is a mixed government in which the democratic element has a superior place.

2. The cardinal took the position that the power which rests originally in the people remains in the people only until the people have chosen or accepted a ruler. Once the ruler is established, the power of the people stops. The ruler is absolute, and is not amenable to the people. By the American theory, kings and rulers are the trustees and servants of the people. In his *Apologia*,[1] Bellarmine repeated the statement of his great work that the people after the transfer of power to a ruler have no power to act against the ruler. No one may without serious crime rebel against a ruler or stir up sedition against him. On the other hand, it is declared in the Virginia Bill of Rights that, when any government shall have been inadequate, "a majority of the community hath an indubitable, inalienable and indefeasible right to reform, alter and abolish it in such manner as shall be judged most conducive to the public weal." As put in the Declaration of Independence, it is "the right of the people to alter and abolish a form of government when it has become destructive of its ends and institute a new form of government."

3. In the Bellarmine scheme there is no word about

[1] As quoted from Ryan and Millar, p. 116.

representatives of the people and parliaments. On the contrary, the Genevan form is condemned for the very reason that it included parliaments or councils. The cardinal could not have commended the assembly at Runnymede reprobated by Innocent III in three bulls. How much, on the other hand, did Hampden, Milton, Sidney and Locke, lay stress upon assemblies representing the people!

4. In Bellarmine religious toleration is outlawed in the strongest terms. In long sections the cardinal argued that there can be no conciliation or agreement between Catholics and heretical dissenters, that the books of heretics should be burned and finally that, like adulterers, heretics should be compelled to retract or be put to death. How utterly at variance with the mediæval view is the position laid down in the Virginia Bill of Rights! Mason's draft of that document demanded that "all men should enjoy the fullest toleration in the exercise of religion." This draft, as modified by the Convention—an act due to Madison—was changed so as to remove the idea of toleration and pronounce for the full equality of every man before the law to follow in his religious belief the dictates of conscience. By his theory of the absolute authority of the papacy in matters of religion, the cardinal was estopped from carrying the ideal of equality into the religious domain. His acceptance of the mediæval theory of the papacy and the church left him no option.

5. The theory of the separation of church and state fully stated in our Constitution—that is, the sovereignty of each estate—is not hinted at by Cardinal Bellarmine. As a proof that some American Catholics seem to hold with the cardinal, it may be proper to cite Father McMahon who said in the *Independent*, November 27th, 1920, "The Puritan doctrine of the separation of church and state is a logical preparation for Bolshevism. Our effort is to undo the effect of the Puritan idea which has permeated this country."

What a contrast this statement presents to the positive views of Jefferson, the author of the Virginia statute of religious liberty!

6. Unjustified is the claim that very clauses and expressions found in the two American documents are taken from Cardinal Bellarmine's treatment. Several cases are given by Dr. Rager revealing alleged identity or similarity in their statements. Thus the writer quotes Bellarmine as "declaring that all men are born *free and equal*, de cler. VII." The supposed corresponding passages in the American documents are then quoted. The fact is that Bellarmine says no such thing. What he says is that all men are born free—*omnes nascuntur liberi*. That is all. He stops there. The Declaration of Independence says all men are created equal and the Virginia Bill of Rights that "all men are born equally free and independent and have certain inherent rights of which they cannot by any compact deprive their posterity."

7. In Bellarmine, not only is the very idea of a governmental compact or covenant wanting, the cardinal does not discuss or mention the division of governmental function—executive, judicial and legislative,—noted long before by Aristotle and made with exact precision in our American government.

The comparison shows, on one hand, the absence in Cardinal Bellarmine's theory of distinctive elements found in the American plan and, on the other, his condemnation of principles it includes. The underlying rights of the people in the first instance to choose their government which Bellarmine dilates, was fully stated by Aristotle in such words as these, that the administration of a household is monarchical while in civil affairs power belongs to all, that nature has made all men equal but all cannot govern at the same time, that the basis of a democratic state is liberty and that the only stable principle of government is

equality according to relative proportion and for every man to enjoy his own. A citizen is one who shares in the governing and being governed. When the ancient writer defined man as by nature a political animal, he meant that it is intended that men live together in orderly communities. So far as Cardinal Bellarmine discusses this fundamental principle he goes, to say the most, no further than the Greek philosopher. Sidney said properly that Filmer had "imparted to the School divines that which was taken up by them as a common motive written in the heart of every man."

V. *The Theory of Popular Authority and its Origin.*— The development of the modern idea of rights inherent in the people was entirely apart from Cardinal Bellarmine and his writings. The cardinal did not follow Aristotle and his discussion of the ephors and their place in Sparta and other Greek cities. On the other hand, Calvin did, making great account of them in his earlier theory which was that aristocracy is the best form of government. In the last years of his life, and, in view of treatises written and published in Geneva, the Protestant Reformer modified his views of civil government. He declared that, though the rights of the people asserted in those treatises were asserted with some harshness, nevertheless the theory was true and that "if any abrogate to himself more than is just, the many may act as censors and masters to resist the ruler's authority." The school of writers, developed under Calvin's eye, took the position that a ruler is amenable to the law of Scripture and that in matters of conscience toward God the individual is supreme, and thus far Calvin had gone. The pupils went further and taught that rulers are bound by a compact entered into between the people and themselves, either by oath or tacit consent. Rulers and people are bound by reciprocal rights and duties. If either breaks the contract, he may be punished. This view had pungent state-

ment in the marginal notes of the Genevan version of the New Testament, prepared in 1557. James I took such umbrage at these notes that he was well ready to institute the work which issued in the Authorized Version of the Scriptures.[1]

One of the chief representatives of this school was the Englishman John Ponet, Bishop of Winchester, who, with other refugees from England, lived for some time in Geneva. He was no less a strict Calvinist in doctrine than, according to the standards of the time, an advanced democrat. Of Ponet's work entitled, *A Treatise on Politike Power*, published in 1556, John Adams said "it contained all the essential principles of government which were afterwards dilated by Sidney and Locke."[2] Ponet's position is shown in the following excerpts:

When the multitude sees that governors are abusing power they may alter the state. The ephors are to see to it that kings do not oppress the people. . . . Pope, emperor or king may do

[1] In an account of the development of the modern theory of government, the name of Marsiglius of Padua deserves an honorable place. He protested against the management of the church exclusively by the priesthood and, 200 years before Calvin, demanded for the laity the right to sit in councils and otherwise join in the direction of church affairs. He was called by Döllinger a Calvinist before Calvin. Marsiglius' theory was adapted to bear fruit in the realm of civil government just as the national conference of the churches of England established by Theodore of Tarsus was the norm for the political union of England and as the church covenants of New England were a basis for civil contracts. The church the Italian defined as a community of Christian people or, as Wyclif and Huss defined it, the body of the elect. He used the expression "consent of the people."

[2] Adams' *Works*, vi, 4. A perfect copy of Ponet's book is in the Congressional Library. Ponet's opening words are that "the laws of nature, first planted in the mind of man and then set forth in the decalogue, were reduced by Christ to the two words: thou shalt love thy Lord thy God above all things and thy neighbor as thyself." Figgis in *Study in Political Thought from Gerson to Grotius*, p. 148, says that "From Buchanan to Rousseau in some form or other the anti-monarchical writers all base their claims to check and, if necessary, to resist the monarch on the notion of the original contract."

nothing to hurt the people without their consent. . . . Kings and princes cannot make laws without the consent of the people. . . . The country and commonwealth is a degree above the king and men ought to have more respect for their country than to their prince, for the commonwealth than to any one person. . . . Commonwealths may flourish where there are no kings. . . . God will not have princes obeyed in all things but they should at times be resisted by one thousand deaths. . . . Civil governors who make and break promises, beswereth and foreswereth, are tyrants and should be deposed and, if necessary, put to death.

Strong sentences like these savor of English freedom projected into the times of the American demand for civil liberty.

The influence of the compact or covenant theory developed in Geneva went out in three directions, to the Huguenots of France, to Holland and to Great Britain, and came in direct line through the Huguenots to the Carolinas and as far north as Boston, through the Dutch to New York and through the English and Scotch and Scotch-Irish to Virginia, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts and the other colonies. In France, where the Huguenots and Jesuits came into deadly conflict, the Jesuits also asserted the right of setting aside princes hostile to the Catholic church. Mariana, 1536–1623, in his book on Kings, commended assassination. Henry III and Henry IV of France, and William the Silent were put to death by persons who were themselves Jesuits or under the influence of the order, as were the Dominicans at that time. For this theory and their plottings, the Jesuits were expelled from Spain, France and other Catholic countries of Europe. Mariana's book was burnt in Paris. The pope himself, Pius V, assented to the proposal of murder in the case of Elizabeth. Gregory XIII, not satisfied with contributing to the Armada, and receiving English agents, engaged in developing the enterprise and with deposing the British queen. Lord Acton,

the Roman Catholic historian, says that "Pius commissioned an assassin to take Elizabeth's life." Recently Dr. Guilday in his work on the Recusants, justifies Pius' measures on the ground "that Elizabeth was not an ordinary usurper but a tyrant of the worst type, without pity, the willing tool of those who hated the Church for gain's sake."[1]

The Huguenot contribution to the theory of civil liberty was that a people has the right to sit in judgment upon a ruler through its magistrates, not as individuals but only as they confer together and act in their official capacity. To the individual this right does not belong. With great clearness and force this view was set forth by Mornay, 1518–1581, in his treatise entitled *Vindiciæ*, a book which John Adams spoke of as making a distinct step in the theory of civil affairs.[2] Mornay's argument is based squarely on the principle that government is by compact, an agreement between people and ruler. He defended the position that "the ruler is the minister of the people and the people the absolute law. As a body their authority is greater than the authority of a ruler." On the principle laid down by the French publicist, William the Silent and the states of Holland, abrogated the rule of Philip II and in 1581 issued the Dutch Declaration of Independence, the first declaration of the kind to be issued. In agreement with Mornay are the opening words of the Virginia Bill of Rights, as "made by

[1] Mariana's famous work *De rege et regis institutione*, issued first in Toledo, 1599, appeared in many editions. In his learned discussion, Reusch denies that its doctrine was authoritatively condemned by the Jesuit general Aquaviva. The latest discussion is by the ex-Jesuit, Graf von Hoensbroech, in his posthumous *Der Jesuiten-Orden, Eine Encyclopaedie*, Leipzig, 1926, under Fürstenmord.

[2] A fine edition of Mornay has recently been issued by Prof. Laski with preface. John Adams, *Works*, vi, 4, presents three stages in the development of the principles of popular government among the English people, represented first by John Ponet, then by Harrington, Mornay and Milton, and finally by Sidney, Locke and Hoadley.

the representatives of the people of Virginia assembled in full and free convention."

Mornay's position was the position of the Puritans in England. Drastic expression had been given to it by John Knox who was at Geneva at the same time as Ponet. In one of his interviews with Queen Mary, the Scotch Reformer laid down the principle that princes, dealing unrighteously with their subjects, may be set aside. "Do you think," said Mary, "that subjects having the power may resist their princes with violence?" "Yea, Madame," was the reply, "no doubt they may when princes exceed their bounds."

In England, the theory of civil government includes in its history the name of Richard Hooker, who was quoted a number of times by Locke and was also quoted by Mr. Jefferson. Locke says: "Equality of men by nature the judicious Hooker looks upon as self-evident in itself" and that Hooker states

> that the lawful power of making laws to command societies of men belongeth properly with the entire societies and it is not in the power of the king to exercise authority himself except by express commission received immediately from God or else by authority derived first from their consent upon whose persons they impose laws.

It will be remembered that among Jefferson's books was a copy of the *Ecclesiastical Polity*. The period of the Long Parliament, Cromwell and Milton, which was likewise the period of the Westminster Assembly, was unexcelled for its contribution to English constitutional liberties. The statement of the Westminster divines that "God alone is lord of the conscience" has never been surpassed as a statement of human liberty, although it was not adequately understood and applied by its authors. Milton whom Jefferson could have read among his own books exclaimed: "Who

swears to a king unless the king on his side is sworn to keep God's laws and the laws of his country!" And further, "Rulers cannot enslave us. There is no royal power but in the courts of the kingdom."

If, at the end of the seventeenth century, new elements were not added by Sidney and John Locke to the Genevan theory of government by consent, it is the merit of these writers to have elaborated the principle of popular sovereignty and to have furnished treatises on government which influenced later political thinkers. "A copy of Sidney's work," to quote Mr. Hunt, "was in every large library in 1776. Every reading man had read it." Sidney went to the block for his opinions. The beautiful copy of Sidney's *Discourses Concerning Government*, consisting of over four hundred pages, still shown in Jefferson's library, is of the edition of 1762. Locke's second treatise the author defined as "an essay concerning the true original extent and end of civil government."

The works of these two writers both by their discussion and the expressions used in them furnished materials for our American statesmen, orators and preachers. Sidney, who in his first sentence refers to Filmer's work and then gives Filmer's epitome of Bellarmine, frequently used such words and clauses as "compact, the good of the governed, the consent of the people, the consent of all such as are concerned." Again and again, he repeated sentences like the following:

> The liberties of nations are from God and from nature and not from kings. All just magisterial power is from the people. If there ever was a just government among men it was constituted by the people. . . . Nations have a right to make their own laws and constitute their own magistrates. . . . Liberty is an exemption from all human laws, to which men have not given their consent. . . . Kings cannot be the interpreters of the oaths they take. . . . Government is not constituted for the good of governors but for the good of the governed. . . . No one

can have any power over a free people but themselves or those to whom they have given it.

A few of John Locke's trenchant clauses are: "The consent of the majority, . . . consenting with others, . . . the consent of the society, . . . the original compact, . . . tacit consent, . . . the law of nature, . . . the state of liberty." He affirmed that

all men are naturally free. . . . No one has power to make laws but by consent of the community and by authority received from the community. . . . Governments are instituted to secure the inalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness and derive their just power from the consent of the governed. If the multitude do institute a government the multitude may abrogate.

John Adams stated the truth when he said that "the same causes which produced Sidney's writings produced the Revolution."

Locke's essays on government open with the words "That men are by nature in a state of perfect freedom and a state also of equality." They close with the sentence "the people have a right to act as supreme and continue the legislative in themselves or elect a new form of government or under the old forms to place it in new hands as they think good." The motto the English philosopher chose for his essays is "that the welfare of the people is the supreme law —*salus populi suprema lex*," and he says that "it is so certainly just and fundamental a rule that he who successfully follows it can not dangerously err." In discussing whether rebellion is ever allowable, he decided that it is, when directed against persons but not when directed against authority.

A cursory examination will show how widely Cardinal Bellarmine's spirit and the spirit of the English writers differ, and the extent to which the cardinal's treatment

lacks principles which they lay down. On the other hand, a cursory reading of the Virginia Bill of Rights and the Declaration of Independence shows the degree of accord existing between these documents and the sentiments of Locke and Sidney and their use of the very words employed by these writers. In his *History of the United States*, Mr. Channing quotes certain passages from Locke to show how much the Declaration of Independence owed him for its phraseology.

VI. *The Mediæval Theory of Government.*—A widespread custom in vogue to-day of exalting the theology of the Middle Ages is also applied to the alleged mediæval governmental theory and practice. The manual of Ryan and Millar has a distinct chapter headed "Our Mediæval Inheritance of Liberty." Combining together Wyclif, Huss, Luther and Calvin, the authors speak of the "antinomian and anti-social tenets" which they ascribe to them as being explicitly counteracted by Bellarmine in his work on the Laity. The fact is that in the Middle Ages the papacy was the supreme authority. As developed by Gregory VII and his successors down to Boniface VIII, the theory assigned this authority to secular matters as well as ecclesiastical. The comparison of the papacy to the sun and to the soul and the empire to the moon and to the human body was meaningless unless it meant that the civil estate is under the control of the spiritual power. According to Gregory, the Roman pontiff is lord of the kings of the earth. No less than eight times did he quote Jeremiah I: 9 to assert his authority over rulers. The passage runs: "I will set thee over the nations, and over the kingdoms to root out and to pull down, and to destroy and to throw down, to build and to plant." The passage was quoted again in these comparatively modern times by Pius V when he deposed Queen Elizabeth. The papal conception of authority was represented in the scene at the Peace of Venice

when Alexander III placed his foot on the shoulder of the prostrate form of Frederick Barbarossa and in the humiliation of John of England who was forced to yield his kingdom to the Roman see as a fief, promising to pay an annual tribute of one thousand marks in perpetuity. In one of the famous bulls of Innocent III the declaration was made that to Peter was committed "not only the whole church but also secular government." *Petro non solum universam ecclesiam sed reliquit sæculam gubernationem.* One of Innocent's immediate successors, Innocent IV, claimed for the papal see pontifical and royal monarchy—*pontificalem et regalem monarchatum.*

Boniface went no further than his predecessors, when in 1302 he announced that both swords are subject to the authority of the pope, namely, the spiritual sword or the power of ecclesiastical discipline which is in his hands, and the temporal sword which at his nod princes must unsheath. Writers of the time of Boniface gave the Roman pontiff power over the pagan world as well as the Christian world. In view of this claim and the Donation of Constantine, Alexander VI, in 1493, divided the lands in the West between Portugal and Spain,—a gift which he made of perpetual validity. That a proper statement of the mediæval theory of government has here been given is attested by the disfavor into which Cardinal Bellarmine fell for limiting the pope's authority in temporal matters to an "indirect" authority. The two theories of government, mediæval and modern, papal and American, would seem to be as far apart as the East from the West.

Has the mediæval theory been abandoned? Utterances of recent popes seem to indicate that it still holds. At any rate, the mediæval theory has not yet been explicitly disavowed. In an allocution of January 9th, 1862, as quoted by Straub,[1] Pius IX called upon the Roman bishops

[1] In his elaborate work on the Church, ii, 547.

to preach that civil sovereignty was conferred upon the Holy See and that under no pretext may he renounce it. His Syllabus of 1864 specifically, though in negative form condemns certain modern ideas of government as known among us, such as the separation of church and state. In 1883 Pius wrote to William I that in some way all baptised persons are subject to the authority of the Roman See. Leo XIII's *immortale dei*, translated by Ryan and Millar, is taken by them as presenting the model form of constitutional government, but to other readers a different interpretation seems the more natural. In fact, in this encyclical Leo seems to reject the theory of the separation of church and state. Recently Pius XI has declared that "Christ's empire is not only over Catholic peoples and over those who, reborn in the font of baptism, belong by right to the church (even though error has driven them far away) for it embraces even those who do not enjoy the Christian faith so that all mankind is under the authority of Jesus Christ." The conclusion at any rate is possible that the same empire which belongs to Christ belongs also to his vicar on earth—the very claim made six hundred years ago by Alexander Triumphus and other writers.[1]

Recent interpretations, of which the Bellarmine-Jefferson legend is only one, are intended to ascribe to Roman Catholic sources and mediæval theories an immediate influence in deciding the popular institutions of this country at its foundation. If they are true, the hitherto accepted statements of history must be abandoned. The following examples may be added to the discussion of the Bellarmine-Jefferson legend. In 1922 Cardinal Bonzano, conversant

[1] Prof. Koch in his *Katholizismus und Jesuitismus* says that "It is a principle of Ultramontanism that the kingdom of God is of this world and that the pope's power includes worldly jurisdiction over states and rulers." Suarez, an authority scarcely below Bellarmine, explicitly taught that the pope may order a nation to set aside its ruler.

through his office as apostolic legate to the Roman Church in the United States with American affairs and recently the papal representative at the Chicago eucharistic congress, in speaking to the students of the American College at Rome, observed: "The United States is based on principles which for centuries have been taught, fearlessly taught, and defended by the Church of Rome."[1] Even by an American of such high eminence as Cardinal Gibbons, the attempt is seriously indulged in to show that the American government and its parts are patterned after the constitution of the Roman Church. The truth is that the Roman government is a hierarchy, self-perpetuating by the appointment of its members. The American government is based on the elective franchise exercised by the people. In the former case, the pope combines in himself executive, legislative and judicial functions and his power is absolute. In the American government, the three functions are clearly distinguished and lodged in different hands. The cardinal goes even so far as to find for the doctrine of papal infallibility a parallel in the announcements of our supreme court. The fact is that the court's decisions are made mandatory by human laws. No American regards them as inerrant. In fact, its decisions announced at one time have in essence been set aside by decisions made at other times.

It was an unfortunate historical mistake that Cardinal Mundelein made at the eucharistic congress of 1926 when he brought Abraham Lincoln into intimate association with a well known Catholic priest, Father St. Cyr, confusing the future president with his cousin.[2] In 1921, when more

[1] See *America*, Feb. 24, 1923.

[2] The complete refutation of the cardinal's statement was made by Dr. Barton in the *Outlook*, July 14, 1926. The cardinal spoke of "the great French priest having been one of Lincoln's close personal friends" and as having used a set of chairs made for him by the future president. Dr. Barton had in his possession the very bill "of $4 for one set of chairs for the Catholic church" rendered in 1838 by Mordecai Lincoln, the President's cousin.

than sixty advertisements appeared in as many issues of the Pittsburgh daily press intended to set forth the doctrines and services of the Roman Catholic Church, one of the advertisements, printed in large type, contained the statement: "The Founder of the Red Cross, St. Camillus of Lellis, was a Catholic." No statement more misleading could well be made. Camillus, who died four hundred years ago instituted a Society of St. John the Baptist to care for persons at the point of death, especially victims of the plague. The good man would have been a prophet indeed if he knew anything of the Red Cross Society which was formed in 1860 and has had for its chief representative Clara Barton. The members of the Order of Camillus may have worn a red cross, but so did members of one of the great orders of the Crusaders five hundred years before. It is almost unpardonable to publish a statement like this intended to confuse the mind of the common man with the notion that the society formed by a Roman priest living four hundred years ago and the society formed in Geneva in 1860 are one and the same.

Another instance of an innovation which it is sought to introduce into our conceptions of American history has appeared in a recent article in the *Catholic Historical Review*, October, 1926, entitled "America a Land of Destiny." The writer, L. J. Kenny, asserts that

> our flag should be associated in its origin with Rome. In using the colors, red, white and blue the makers of America made a bold profession of the Christian belief in the Trinity. St. John of Matha and his Order of the Holy Trinity for the Redemption of Christian Captives used the banner of red, white and blue.

It is also remarked by the author that

> as for our Constitution, the American colonies in breaking away from the political system of Great Britain pushed back into the

theory of government of the great Catholic schools of philosophy of the past. Equality before the law, and government by the consent of the governed are good old Catholic treasures.

Such genial observations are a good illustration of the mediæval method of allegory applied at one time in the interpretation of the Song of Solomon and still apparently of value in narrating the facts of history. Conclusions such as these may easily become widespread popular convictions when published by the ably edited *Catholic Historical Review* and other Catholic periodicals.

The charge has even been made that an accurate history of the United States has yet to be written and if such claims as are made by the Bellarmine-Jefferson theory are well founded, no historian has accurately given a history of the origin of American popular rights. At a meeting of the Board of Directors of the Knights of Columbus held in Chicago, January 13th, 1924, Mr. Gaillard Hunt said: "That the object of the order was to exalt the Catholic Church in the sight of the country and diminish prejudice against it. A real history of the United States should be undertaken." He continued by observing that no one was so qualified to undertake the task as the Knights of Columbus and then proposed a plan for such a work. In considering this charge it must certainly seem strange that all our historians, in dealing hitherto with the foundations of our government, should have been so utterly unfamiliar with the origin of the theories upon which it is based as to have omitted all reference even to the very name of Cardinal Bellarmine. If the Bellarmine-Jefferson legend were fact, then the treatment which all our American historians have given of the Declaration of Independence, as has been said, must in part be discarded. In proof of this statement the judgment of Professor Muzzey, made in his Life of Jefferson, may be adduced. "The natural rights of man is a doctrine

as old as the Roman law, and government by consent of the governed was a principle for which the republicans of the 17th century had fought their battles against the Stuart kings. It is doubtful whether Jefferson had read in 1776 a word of Rousseau's *Contrat Social.* For a decade he had been a profound student of Coke and Milton, Harrington and Locke." To this statement the contradictory clause would have to be added that "Nevertheless, Mr. Jefferson was immediately indebted to the Jesuit writer of the 17th century, Cardinal Bellarmine, for the principles set forth in the Declaration." Such a clause would blot out with one stroke one of the most noteworthy chapters in modern history, the struggle for popular liberties and representative government carried on by adherents of the Reformation in Geneva, by the Huguenots, in Holland and especially in Great Britain and the American Colonies,—a struggle carried on between assemblies and kings and by an array of statesmen and political and ecclesiastical writers.

NOTE The following statements by one who occupies a position of highest eminence in the Roman Catholic Church of the United States shows how far the Jefferson-Bellarmine legend is accepted. According to the *Catholic News*, October 22, 1927, Cardinal Hayes of New York in an address to the National Council of Catholic Men, Detroit, October 18, 1927, "pointed out that the Virginia Bill of Rights was taken almost verbatim from the writings of the Venerable Robert Bellarmine, the trusted adviser of four popes," and said further: "it is with great pride as Catholics that we can recall that the principles, almost the very language of our Declaration of Independence, were written by the Venerable Bellarmine,—now on his way to canonization,—with the approbation of the Holy Father more than a century before the Declaration announced a new reign of liberty to the world."

LIST OF MEMBERS

Membership in the Society is of four classes: Life, Sustaining, Active, and Library members. In the following List the first three classes are grouped together, and the Life members and the Sustaining members are indicated by ** and * respectively, prefixed to their names. The Library members are listed in a separate group.

Members are requested to inform the Secretary of any inaccuracies or omissions with respect to the entries connected with their names.

I Life, Sustaining, and Active Members

ADAMS, ARTHUR, Episcopalian, Rev.; Assistant Minister in Christ Church, Hartford, Conn.; Professor of English, and Librarian, in Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.; Ph.D. (Yale University); S. T. M. (Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Philadelphia, 1916).

ADDISON, DANIEL DULANY, Episcopalian, Rev.; 265 St. Paul St., Brookline, Mass.; D.D. (Union College, 1901).

AINSLIE, PETER, Disciple, Rev.; Minister Christian Temple, Baltimore, Md.; D.D. (Drake University, 1911; Yale University, 1914); LL.D. (Bethany College, 1914).

ALLISON, WILLIAM HENRY, Baptist, Rev.; Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Colgate Theological Seminary, Hamilton, N. Y.; Ph.D. (University of Chicago, 1905).

ARIGA, TETSUTARO, of the United Brethren; Lecturer in Church History, Doshisha University, Kyoto, Japan; S.T.M. (Union Theological Seminary, N. Y., 1924).

ARPEE, LEON, Presbyterian, Rev.; Pastor of Marquette Park Presbyterian Church, Chicago, Ill.

Ayer, Joseph Cullen, Jr., Episcopalian, Rev.; Professor of Church History in the Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Philadelphia; Ph.D. (Leipzig, 1893); S.T.D. (University of the South, 1917).

Ayres, Samuel Gardiner, Methodist, Rev.; Assistant Librarian of Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.; B.D. (Drew Theological Seminary, 1894).

Baillie, Charles Tupper, Presbyterian, Rev.; Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Bloomington, Ill.; M.A. (Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada, 1906); B.D. (Union Theological Seminary, New York, 1912).

Bainton, Roland Herbert, Congregationalist, Rev.;Assistant Professor in Church History, Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.; Ph.D. (Yale University, 1921).

Baird, Andrew Browning, Presbyterian, Rev.; Acting Principal and Professor of Church History, Manitoba College, Winnipeg, Canada; D.D. (Knox College, Toronto, 1902).

Barnes, William Wright, Baptist, Rev.; Professor of Church History in the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Seminary Hill, Texas; Th.D. (Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1913).

Beardsley, Frank Grenville, Congregationalist, Rev.; Pastor of the Fountain Park Congregational Church, St. Louis, Mo.; Ph.D. (Illinois Wesleyan University, 1897; S.T.D. (Kansas City University, 1912).

Bedikian, Antranig Arakel, Congregationalist, Rev.; Pastor of the Armenian Evangelical Church, New York City; M.A. (University of Chicago, 1914); B.D. (*ibid.*, 1915).

Bender, Harold Stauffer, Mennonite, layman; Professor of Church History and Biblical Languages, Goshen College, Goshen, Ind.; M.A. (Princeton University, 1903); Th.M. (Princeton Theological Seminary, 1923).

Benson, Louis FitzGerald, Presbyterian, Rev.; Councilor and Honorary Librarian of The Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia; D.D. (University of Pennsylvania, 1896).

Bird, Remsen Dubois, Presbyterian, Rev.; President of Occidental College, Los Angeles, California; B.D. (Princeton Theological Seminary, 1912); D.D. (Lafayette College, 1919)

Bland, Salem Goldsworth, Methodist, Rev.; Pastor of the Western United Church, Toronto, Canada; D.D. (Queen's University, Kingston, 1903).

Boe, Lars Wilhelm, Lutheran, Rev.; President of St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn.; D.D. (Roanoke College, 1921).

Brooks, Robert N.; Professor in Gammon Theological Seminary, South Atlanta, Ga.

Browne, F. Z., Presbyterian, Rev.; Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Texarkana, Texas.

Budd, Henry George, Methodist, Rev.; President of Wesley Collegiate Institute, Dover, Del.; M.A. (Dickinson College, 1894); D.D. (ibid., 1913).

Burdick, William Lewis, Seventh Day Baptist, Rev.; Corresponding Secretary of the Seventh Day Baptist Missionary Society, Ashaway, R. I.; D.D. (Salem College 1909; Alfred University, 1910).

Burr, George Lincoln, Professor Emeritus of Medieval History in Cornell University Ithaca, N. Y.; LL.D. (University of Wisconsin, 1904); Litt.D. (Western Reserve University 1905).

Byrer, Charles Emory, Episcopalian, Rev.; Professor of Church History, Canon Law, and Ecclesiastical Policy in Bexley Hall, Kenyon College, Gambier, O.; A.M. (Otterbein University, 1902); D.D. (Otterbein College, 1922).

Carter, James, Presbyterian, Rev.; Professor of Church History and Sociology, Lincoln University, Chester Co., Pa.; D.D. (Franklin and Marshall College, 1921).

Case, Shirley Jackson, Baptist; Professor of the History of Early Christianity, the University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; B.D. (Yale University, 1904); Ph.D. (Yale University, 1906); D.D. (*ibid*,. 1917).

Christie, Francis Albert, Unitarian, layman; Professor of Church History in Meadville Theological Seminary, Meadville, Pa.; D.D. (Amherst College, 1909).

Clark, Calvin Montague, Congregationalist, Rev.; Professor of Church History, Bangor Theological Seminary, Bangor, Maine; D.D. (Williams College, 1914).

Collins, Ross William, Rev.; Assistant Professor of History, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.; D.B. (Union Theological Seminary, N. Y., 1918); Ph.D. (Columbia University, 1923).

Cooke, Richard Joseph, Methodist, Rev.; Bishop, Methodist Episcopal Church, Athens, Tenn.; D.D. (University of Tennessee); LL.D. (Willamette University).

Cornett, John Stanley, Presbyterian, Rev.; Professor of Bible, College of Emporia, Emporia, Kan.; S.T.M. (Union Theological Seminary, N. Y., 1921); Ph.D. (University of Chicago, 1925).

Corwin, Charles Edward, Reformed, Rev.; Editor of the Documents of the Collegiate Reformed Church in New York; Ocean Grove, N. J.; M.A. (Rutgers College, 1907); B.D. (*ibid.*, 1895).

Crusius, Paul Nicholas, Lutheran, Rev.; Professor of History, Elmhurst College, and Principal of Elmhurst College Academy, Elmhurst, Ill.; A.M. (Harvard, 1916).

Dau, William Herman Theodore, Lutheran, Rev.; President of Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Ind.

Decker, Theodore Carl Robert, Lutheran, Rev.; Pastor, Philadelphia; S.T.M. (Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, 1918).

Demarest, William Henry Steele, Reformed, Rev.; President of the New Brunswick Theological Seminary, at New Brunswick, N. J.; D.D. (Rutgers College, 1901); LL.D. (Columbia University, 1910; Union College, 1911; University of Pittsburgh, 1912).

Dietrich, Otto Herman, Presbyterian, Rev.; Pastor of the First German Presbyterian Church, Orange, N. J.

EAKIN, FRANK, Presbyterian, Rev.; Professor of Church History, Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Ph.D.

EELLS, HASTINGS, Presbyterian, Rev.; Professor of History, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, O.; B.D. (Princeton Theological Seminary, 1919); Ph.D. (Yale University, 1921).

EGAN, JOSEPH MICHAEL, Catholic, Rev.; Professor of Church History in Dunwoodie Seminary, Yonkers, N. Y.; A.M. (Catholic University, 1915); S.T.L. (Catholic University, 1917).

EMERTON, EPHRAIM, Unitarian, layman; Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; Ph.D. (Leipzig, 1876).

FAULKNER, JOHN ALFRED, Methodist, Rev.; Professor of Church History in Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.; D.D. (Wesleyan University, 1897, Acadia College, 1902); LL.D. (Pennsylvania College, 1919).

FRITSCHEL, GEORGE JOHN, Lutheran, Rev.; Professor of Church History, Wartburg Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa; D.D. (Thiel College, 1916).

GARBER, PAUL NEFF, Methodist, Rev.; Professor of Church History, School of Religion, Duke University, Durham, N. C.; Ph.D. (University of Pennsylvania).

GARRISON, WINFRED ERNEST, Disciple, Rev.; Dean of the Disciples Divinity House of the University of Chicago, and Associate Professor of Church History in the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; B.D. (University of Chicago); Ph.D. (*ibid.*, 1897).

GAVIN, FRANK, Episcopalian, Rev.; Professor of Ecclesiastical History, General Theological Seminary, Chelsea Sq., New York City.; Th.D. (Harvard University, 1919); Ph.D. (Columbia University, 1923).

GEORGE, E. F., Evangelical, Rev.; Professor of Historical Theology in the Evangelical Theological Seminary, Naperville, Ill.; B.D. (Naperville, 1916); A.M. (University of Chicago, 1924).

GIFFORD, WILLIAM ALVA, Methodist Church of Canada, Rev.; Professor of Ecclesiastical History Wesleyan Theological College, Montreal, Canada; B.D. (Victoria College, Toronto, 1909); S.T.M. (Harvard University, 1914); Th.D. (*ibid.*, 1915).

GILLESPIE, JAMES PACKARD, Presbyterian, Rev.; White Plains, N. Y.; M.A. (Columbia University, 1911); B.D. (Union Theological Seminary, New York City, 1907).

GOODENOUGH, ERWIN RAMSDELL, Methodist, Rev.; Instructor in History at Yale University, New Haven; S.T.B. (Garrett Biblical Institute, 1917); D. Phil. (Oxford University, 1923.)

GRAY, ARTHUR ROMEYN, Episcopalian, Rev.; Secretary for Latin-America of the Board of Missions of the Protestant Episcopal Church, New York City; D.D. (University of the South).

GREENE, EVARTS BOUTELL, Episcopalian, layman; Professor of American History, Columbia University, New York City; Ph.D. (Harvard, 1893).

GREENE, THEODORE AINSWORTH, Congregationalist, Rev.; Pastor of the First Congregational Church, New Britain, Conn.; M.A. (Columbia University).

**GRISCOM, ACTON, Episcopalian, Rev.; Curate at the Chapel of the Comforter, New York City.

GRUBER, L. FRANKLIN, Lutheran, Rev.; Maywood, Ill.; A.M. (Muhlenburg College, 1901); D.D. (*ibid.*, 1918); LL.D. (Thiel College, 1921).

GUILDAY, PETER, Catholic, Rev.; Professor of Church History, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.; Docteur ès Sciences Morales et Historiques (Louvain, 1914); LL.D. (Notre Dame University, 1925); Chevalier de l'Ordre de Leopold II, 1926).

GUMMEY, HENRY RILEY, Episcopalian, Rev.; Rector of St. James's Church, East Downingtown, Pa.; S.T.D. (Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Philadelphia 1905).

** Life Member.

HAMMARSKÖLD, J. GOTTFRIED, Episcopalian, Rev.; Superintendent of Swedish Missions, Yonkers, N. Y.; D.D. (Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, 1913).

HARRIS, WILMER CARLYLE; Box 584, Athens, Ohio; M.A. (University of Michigan, 1909); Ph.D. (University of Chicago, 1914).

HAYS, ARTHUR ALEXANDER, Presbyterian, Rev.; Professor of Ecclesiastical History in McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois; D.D. (Washington and Jefferson College, 1915).

HEALY, PATRICK JOSEPH, Catholic, Rev.; Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the Catholic University, Washington, D. C.; D.D. (The Catholic University, 1903).

HEATHCOTE, CHARLES WILLIAM, Lutheran, Rev.; Pastor Boulevard Lutheran Church, Philadelphia; Lecturer in Church History and Religious Education, Theological Department, Temple University, Philadelphia; A.M. (University of Pennsylvania, 1913); S.T.D. (Temple University, 1910).

HEINTZE, RICHARD WILHELM, Lutheran, Rev.; Librarian, Concordia Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.

HERRON, CHARLES, Presbyterian, Rev.; Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Missions, Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Omaha, Neb.; D.D. (Miami University, 1901; University of Pittsburgh, 1912).

HINKE, WILLIAM JOHN, Presbyterian, Rev.; Professor of Semitic Languages and Religions in Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.; Ph.D. (University of Pennsylvania, 1906); D.D. (Heidelberg University, 1906).

HOFFMAN, MILTON J., Reformed, Rev.; Professor of Church History, New Brunswick Theological Seminary, New Brunswick, N. J.; B.A. (Oxford University, 1912); D.D. (Hope College, 1918).

HOOD, EDMUND LYMAN, Congregationalist, Rev.; Roseland, La.; Ph.D. (New York University, 1899).

HORSTMANN, JULIUS HERMAN, Lutheran, Rev.; Editor of *The Evangelical Herald* and *The Evangelical Year Book*, St. Louis, Mo.

HOUGH, LYNN HAROLD, Methodist, Rev.; Pastor of the Central Methodist Episcopal Church, Detroit, Mich.; B.D. (Drew Theological Seminary, 1905); D.D. (Mt. Union Scio College, 1912).

JACKSON, FREDERICK JOHN FOAKES, Anglican, Rev.; Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge; Professor of Christian Institutions, Union Theological Seminary, New York City; M.A. (University of Cambridge, 1882); B.D. (*ibid.*, 1903); D.D. (*ibid.*, 1905).

JACOBS, CHARLES MICHAEL, Lutheran, Rev.; President of the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Mt. Airy, Philadelphia; D.D. (Muhlenberg College, 1913).

JACOBS, HENRY EYSTER Lutheran, Rev.; Dean of the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.; D.D. (Pennsylvania College, 1877); LL.D. (Thiel College, 1892); S.T.D. (Muhlenberg College, 1907).

JOHNSON, ELMER ELLSWORTH SCHULTZ, Schwenkfeldian, Rev.; Pastor of the Hereford Mennonite Church at Bally, Pa.; Editor of the *Corpus Schwenckfeldianorum*, Pennsburg, Pa.; Associate Professor of Modern Church History in Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn.; Ph.D. (Hartford Theological Seminary, 1911); D.D. (Franklin and Marshall College, 1924).

JOHNSON, JESSE, Presbyterian, Rev.; Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Apologetics, Xenia Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.; D.D. (Grove City College, 1897.)

JONES, ROBERT ELLIS, Episcopalian, Rev.; Canon of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, New York City; D.D. (Williams College, 1897).

KEEP, AUSTIN BAXTER, Episcopalian, layman; member of Department of History, College of the City of New York, New York; Ph.D. (Columbia University, 1911).

KELSO, JOHN MASON, Methodist, Rev.; Pastor of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and Professor in the Wesley Collegiate Institute, Dover, Del.; B.D. (Drew Theological Seminary, 1907).

KIEFFER, GEORGE LINN, Lutheran, Rev.; Rosedale, Long Island, N. Y.; Financial Secretary of the National Lutheran Council; Associate Editor of the *Lutheran World Almanac* and *Annual Encyclopædia*, and Reference Librarian of the Lutheran Bureau of the National Lutheran Council, New York; B.D. (Union Theological Seminary, New York, 1914); M.A. (Columbia University, 1915).

KING, GEORGE WALES, Presbyterian, Rev.; Pastor of the Markham Memorial Presbyterian Church, St. Louis, Mo.; D.D. (Westminster College, 1923).

KLEIN, ARTHUR JAY, Presbyterian, layman; State, War and Navy Building, Washington, D. C.; A.M. (Columbia University, 1909); B.D. (Union Theological Seminary, 1909); Ph.D. (Columbia University, 1917).

KNUBEL, FREDERICK H., Lutheran, Rev.; President of the United Lutheran Church in America, 437 Fifth Avenue, New York City; D.D. (Pennsylvania College, 1911); LL.D. (Thiel College, 1919).

KNUDSON, JOHN IMMANUEL; Assistant Professor of History and Acting Professor of Church History, Franklin College, Franklin, Ind.; A.M. (University of Chicago, 1921).

KUSIW, BASIL, Presbyterian, Rev.; Instructor in the Ukrainian Language and Literature, Bloomfield Theological Seminary, Bloomfield, N. J.

LANE, CHARLES STODDARD, Presbyterian, Rev.; Vice-President of Hartford School of Religious Pedagogy, Professor of Church History in Hartford School of Religious Pedagogy, Lecturer on Presbyterian Polity in Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn.; D.D. (College of Wooster, 1914).

LaPiana, Giorgio F., Teaching Fellow in Harvard University; S.T.L. (Theological School of Monreale, Sicily, 1900); Licencié ès lettres (University of Geneva, 1908); Ph.D. (University of Palermo, 1912).

Lappin, Henry A.; Professor of the English Language and Literature, D'Youville College for Women, Buffalo, N. Y.; D. Litt. (Canisius College, 1920).

Leach, Henry Goddard, Episcopalian, layman; Editor of *The Forum*, New York City; M.A. (Harvard, 1906); Ph.D. (*ibid.*, 1908).

Lee, Umphrey, Methodist, Rev.; Pastor of the Highland Park Methodist Episcopal Church, Dallas, Texas.; M.A. (Southern Methodist University, 1916).

Leinbach, Paul Seibert, Reformed, Rev.: Editor of the *Reformed Church Messenger*, Philadelphia, Pa.; D.D. (Heidelberg University, 1912).

Leonard, William Andrew, Episcopalian, Rt. Rev.; Bishop of Ohio; Cleveland, Ohio; D.D. (St. Stephen's College, 1880; Washington and Lee University, 1885).

Levanoux, Maurice, 1 Primus Ave., Boston, Mass.

Lew, Timothy Tingfang, Professor and Dean of the Faculty of Theology, Peking University, Peking, China; B.D. (Yale, 1918); Ph.D. (Columbia University, 1919).

Lewis, Leicester Crosby, Episcopalian, Rev.; Villa Nova, Pa.; A.M. (Columbia University, 1911); B.D. (General Theological Seminary, 1912); Ph.D. (University of Pennsylvania, 1925).

Lindsay, Frederic Nye, Presbyterian, Rev.; Pastor of the Greene Avenue Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.; B.D. (Yale University, 1894); Ph.D. (Columbia University, 1912).

*Loetscher, Frederick William, Presbyterian, Rev.; Professor of Church History in Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J.; Editor of the *Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society;* Ph.D. (Princeton University, 1906); D.D. (Lafayette College, 1914); LL.D. (University of Dubuque, 1918).

Loomis, Louise Ropes, Professor of History, Wells College, Aurora, N. Y.; Ph.D. (Columbia, 1906).

Lunt, William E.; Professor of English Constitutional History, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.; Ph.D. (Harvard University, 1908).

Lyttle, Charles Harold, Unitarian, Rev.; Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Meadville Theological School, Meadville, Pa.; S.T.M. (Harvard University, 1913); Ph.D. (Meadville Theological School, 1923).

Macfarland, Charles Stedman, Congregationalist, Rev.; General Secretary of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, New York; Ph.D. (Yale University, 1899); D.D. (Ursinus College, 1916; University of Paris, 1918).

McGiffert, Arthur Cushman, Congregationalist, Rev.; Professor of Church History, Union Theological Seminary, New York City; Ph.D. (Marburg, 1888); D.D. (Western Reserve University, 1892; Harvard University, 1906); LL.D. (Pennsylvania College, 1917).

Macmillan, Kerr Duncan, Presbyterian, layman; President of Wells College, Aurora, New York; B.D. (Princeton Theological Seminary, 1897); S.T.D. (Hobart College, 1913).

McNeill, John Thomas, Presbyterian, Rev.; Professor of Church History, The Divinity School of the University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; B.D. (Westminster Hall, 1912); Ph. D. (University of Chicago, 1920).

McQuary, Rodney L., Disciple, Rev.; Professor of Church History and Pastoral Theology in the College of the Bible, Lexington, Ky.; B.D. (Yale Divinity School, 1916).

* Sustaining Member.

MANHART, FRANK P., Lutheran, Rev.; Dean of the Department of Theology of the Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove, Pa.; President of the Lutheran Historical Society in America (since 1911); A.M. (University of Pennsylvania, 1909); D.D. (Gettysburg College, 1899).

MATHER, THOMAS BRADLEY, Methodist, Rev.; Pastor of the Methodist Church of Marshall, Mo.; Professor of Church History, Central College, Fayette, Mo.; M.A. (Princeton University, 1916); Th.D. (Xenia Theological Seminary, 1927).

MENDENHALL, HARLAN GEORGE, Presbyterian, Rev.; Pastor Emeritus of the West Twenty-third Street Presbyterian Church, New York City.

MERRILL, ELMER TRUESDELL, Episcopalian, Rev.; Santa Barbara, Calif.; M.A. (Wesleyan, 1889); Litt.D. (Kenyon, 1924); LL.D. (St. Andrews, 1911).

MEYER, HENRY HERMAN, Methodist, Rev.; Editor, Sunday School Publications, Methodist Book Concern, New York City; A.M. (Baldwin-Wallace College, 1903); D.D. (Nast Theological Seminary, 1910).

MILLER, EDWARD WAITE, Reformed, Rev.; Pastor of Community Church, Locust Valley, N. Y.; D.D. (Union College, 1892).

MITCHELL, EDWIN KNOX, Congregationalist, Rev.; Professor of Græco-Roman and Eastern Church History in Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn.; D.D. (Marietta College, 1896).

MOEHLMAN, CONRAD HENRY, Baptist, Rev.; Professor of Church History, Rochester Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.; Ph.D. (University of Michigan, 1918).

MOORE, JOHN FERGUSON, Presbyterian, layman; Secretary of the International Committee of Young Men's Christian Association, 347 Madison Ave., New York City.

MOOSE, JOHN BAXTER, Lutheran, Rev.; Professor of Historical Theology in the Theological Seminary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Chicago, Maywood, Ill.; B.D. (*ibid.*, 1915); Ph.D. (Hartford Theological Seminary, 1925).

MOSES, WALTER VIVIAN, Moravian, Rev.; Professor in the Moravian College and Theological Seminary, Bethlehem, Pa.; M.A. (Moravian College, 1910); Ph.D. (*ibid.*, 1914).

MUDD, JOHN ALEXIS, Episcopalian, layman; U. S. N.; P. O. Box 770, New York City.

MULLER, JAMES ARTHUR, Episcopalian, Rev.: Professor of Church History, Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass.; B.D. (Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, 1910); Ph.D. (Princeton University, 1915).

NAGLER, ARTHUR WILFORD, Methodist, Rev.; Assistant Professor in Church History in Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.; Th.D. (Harvard, 1915).

NEVE, JUERGEN LUDWIG, Lutheran, Rev.; Professor of History of Doctrines and Symbolics in the Hamma Divinity School of Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio; D.D. (Wittenberg College, 1902; Carthage College); D.Th. (University of Kiel, 1924).

NEWMAN, ALBERT HENRY, Baptist, Rev.; Professor of Church History, Mercer University, Macon, Ga.; LL.D. (Southwestern Baptist University, 1883; McMaster University, 1914); D.D. (Mercer University, 1885).

NEWMAN, LOUIS ISRAEL, Jewish, Rev.; 125 Jordan Ave., San Francisco, Calif.; Ph.D. (Columbia University, 1924).

NICHOLS, ROBERT HASTINGS, Presbyterian, Rev.; Professor of Church History in Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.; Ph.D. (Yale University, 1896); D.D. (George Washington University, 1921).

NILES, EDWARD, Rev.; 8321 Vietor Place, Elmhurst, Long Island, New York.

NORWOOD, PERCY VARNEY, Episcopalian, Rev.; Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Western Theological Seminary, Downers Grove, Ill.; A.M. (Harvard University, 1907); B.D. (Berkeley Divinity School, 1911).

OAKLEY, THOMAS POLLOCK, Presbyterian, layman; Professor of History and Social Sciences, Hardin College, Mexico, Mo.; Ph.D. (Columbia University, 1923).

Otis, Arthur H., Professor in the University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz.

Pannkoke, Otto Hermann, Lutheran, Rev.; 447 N. Lombard St., Oak Park, Chicago; B.D. (Union Theological Seminary, New York, 1915); D.D. (Lenoir College, 1920).

Parsons, Ernest William, Baptist, Rev.; Professor of New Testament Interpretation, Rochester Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.; Ph.D. (University of Chicago, 1912); D.D. (McMaster University, 1923).

Peardon, Thomas Preston; Instructor in History, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York City; M. A. (Clark, 1922).

Polack, William Gustave, Lutheran, Rev.; Professor of Theology, Concordia Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.

Pomeroy, Ralph Brouwer, Episcopalian, Rev.; Professor of Ecclesiastical Polity in the General Theological Seminary, New York; Llewellyn Park, W. Orange, N. J.; B.D. (General Theological Seminary, 1903); M.A. (Princeton University, 1913; Columbia University, 1913).

Porter, Thomas Jackson, Presbyterian, Rev.; Professor of Church History, Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Campinas, Est. de San Paolo, Brazil; Ph.D. (Westminster College, Pa., 1897); S.T.D. (Miami University, 1917).

Pratt, Davie Butler, Congregationalist, Rev.; Dean and Professor of Sociology and Church History in Howard University School of Religion, Washington, D. C.; D.D. (Howard University, 1914).

Randolph, Corliss Fitz, Seventh Day Baptist; President of the Seventh Day Baptist Historical Society; Editor of the *Seventh Day Baptist Year Book*, Newark, N. J.; L.H.D. (Alfred University, 1903); LL.D. (Salem College, 1913).

Rees, Silas, Congregationalist, Rev.; Instructor in the Church History Department in Union Theological Seminary, New York City; Grantwood, N. J.; S.T.M. (Union Theological Seminary, 1921); D.D. (University of London, 1924).

RHINOW, ARTHUR B., Presbyterian, Rev.; Pastor of the Ridgewood Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.; A.M. (University of California, 1905).

RICHARDS, GEORGE WARREN, Reformed, Rev.; President and Professor of Church History, the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the United States, Lancaster, Pa.; D.D. (Franklin and Marshall College, 1902).

RICHARDSON, ERNEST CUSHING, Director of the Library of Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.; A.M. (Amherst College 1883; Princeton University, 1896); Ph.D. (Washington and Jefferson College, 1887).

ROBINSON, GEORGE WASHINGTON, Congregationalist; Secretary of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

*ROCKWELL, WILLIAM WALKER, Congregationalist, Rev.; Librarian of Union Theological Seminary, New York City; S.T.L. (Marburg, 1903); Ph.D. (Göttingen, 1914).

ROLLINS, WALLACE EUGENE, Episcopalian, Rev.; Professor of Church History in the Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary in Virginia, Alexandria, Va.; B.D. (Yale University, 1895); D.D. (Virginia Theological Seminary, 1915).

ROMOSER, GEORGE AUGUST, Lutheran, Rev.; President of Concordia Collegiate Institute, Bronxville, N. Y.

ROTH, PAUL H., Lutheran, Rev.; Professor in the Northwestern Lutheran Theological Seminary, Minneapolis, Minn.

SADLER, ALFRED JOHN, Presbyterian, Rev.; Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Jersey City, N. J.; B.D. (Union Theological Seminary, New York City, 1917).

SAEZ, FLORENCIO, 600 West 122nd Street, New York City.

SCHAFF, DAVID SCHLEY, Presbyterian, Rev.; Professor Emeritus of Church History, Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pa.; D.D. (Illinois College, 1891; University of Geneva, Switzerland, 1909).

* Sustaining Member.

Scherer, Melanchthon Gideon Groseclose, Lutheran, Rev.; Secretary of the United Lutheran Church in America, 437 Fifth Ave., New York; D.D. (Roanoke College, 1903).

Schermerhorn, William David, Methodist, Rev.; Professor of Church History and Missions at Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.; A.M. (University of Chicago); D.D. (Garrett Biblical Institute; Kansas Wesleyan); LL.D. (Dakota Wesleyan).

Schneider, Carl Edward, Evangelical, Rev.; Professor of Church History, Eden Theological Seminary, Webster Grove, Mo.; A.M. (Washington University, 1922).

Schwarze, William Nathaniel, Moravian, Rev.; Professor of Moravian Church History and Homiletics in the Moravian College and Theological Seminary, Bethlehem, Pa., Archivist of the Northern Province of the Moravian Church in America, President of the Moravian Historical Society; Ph.D. (Moravian College and Theological Seminary, 1910).

Scott, Ernest Findlay, Professor of Biblical Theology, Union Theological Seminary, New York; D.D. (St. Andrews University, Scotland, 1909).

**Severance, Allen Dudley, Presbyterian; formerly Professor of History, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.

Shaw, Plato Ernest, Methodist, Rev.; Associate Professor of Church History, Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn.; M.A. (Columbia University, 1919); S.T.M. (Union Theological Seminary, N. Y., 1920); B.Litt. (Oxford, 1924).

Sheldon, Henry Clay, Methodist, Rev.; Professor of Systematic Theology in Boston University, Boston, Mass.; D.D. (Lawrence University, 1887).

Shewmaker, William Orpheus, Presbyterian, Rev.; Professor in Southwestern College, Memphis Tenn.; Ph.D. (Hartford Theological Seminary, 1914).

** Life Member.

SIMMONS, LUCY; Associate Professor in State Teachers College, Kirksville, Mo.

SMITH, C. HENRY, Mennonite, layman; Professor of History, Bluffton College, Bluffton, Ohio; Ph.D. (University of Chicago, 1907).

SMITH, PRESERVED, Professor of History, Cornell University. Ithaca, N. Y.; Ph.D. (Columbia University, 1907); Litt., D. (Muhlenberg College, 1912).

SNOWDEN, LOUISE HORTENSE, Episcopalian; The Lenox, 13th and Spruce Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

SPAUDE, PAUL WILLIAM, Lutheran, Rev.; Lake Benton, Minn.; B.A. (Augustana College, 1924); S.T.M. (Wittenberg College 1926).

SPINKA, MATTHEW, Reformed, Rev.; Lecturer on Eastern Church History, the Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.; B.D. (Chicago Theological Seminary, 1916); M.A. (Divinity School of the University of Chicago, 1919); Ph.D. (University of Chicago, 1923).

STEIMLE, AUGUSTUS, Lutheran, Rev.; Pastor of the Church of the Advent, New York; D.D. (Muhlenberg College, 1914).

STOCKER, HARRY EMILIUS, Moravian, Rev.; Pastor of the First Moravian Church of New York City; Executive Secretary of the American Society in Aid of Moravian Missions; Ph.D. (Moravian College, 1913).

STOUT, JAMES COFFIN, Presbyterian, Rev.; Professor of Church History in the Biblical Seminary in New York, New York City; B.D. (Princeton Theological Seminary, 1910); D.D. (College of Wooster, 1925).

STUCKERT, HOWARD MORRIS, Episcopalian, Rev.; Assistant Professor of European History, Ohio State University, Columbus, O.; M.A. (University of Pennsylvania, 1915).

SULLIVAN, WILLIAM LAURENCE, Unitarian, Rev.; 5259 Enright Ave., St. Louis, Mo.; S.T.L. (Catholic University of America, 1900); D.D. (Meadville Theological School, 1917).

SWEET, WILLIAM WARREN, Methodist, Rev.; Professor of Church History, The Divinity School of the University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; B.D. (Drew Theological Seminary, 1906); Th.M. (Crozer Theological Seminary, 1907); A.M. (University of Pennsylvania, 1909); Ph.D. (*ibid.*, 1912).

TENNEY, SAMUEL MILLS, Presbyterian, Rev.; Pastor-at-large of the Presbytery of Eastern Texas; Rusk, Tex.; President of the Presbyterian Historical Society of the Synod of Texas; D.D. (Austin College, 1917).

THOMSON, SAMUEL HARRISON, Presbyterian, Rev.; Instructor in Biblical Literature, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.; Ph.D. (Charles University, Prague, 1925); B.Litt. (Faculty of Theology, Oxford, 1926).

TIPPLE, EZRA SQUIER, Methodist, Rev.; President and Professor of Practical Theology, Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.; A.M. (Syracuse University, 1885); Ph.D. (*ibid.*, 1886); D.D. (*ibid.*, 1899); LL.D. (*ibid.*, 1913).

TRYON, HAROLD HARRISON, Presbyterian; Assistant Professor of Church History, Union Theological Seminary, New York City; B.D. (*ibid.*, 1904).

TUCKER, ROBERT LEONARD, Methodist, Rev.; Pastor of the Indianola M. E. Church, Columbus, O.; Ph.D. (Columbia University, 1918).

VANDERLAAN, ELDRED CORNELIUS, Reformed, Rev.; Kinderhook, N. Y.; Th.D. (Union Theological Seminary, N. Y., 1904).

*WASHBURN, HENRY BRADFORD, Episcopalian, Rev.; Dean of the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass; D.D. (Episcopal Theological School of Cambridge, 1918); LL.D. (Hobart College, 1923).

WEBER, HENRY JACOB, Presbyterian, Rev.; President and Professor of Theology and Church History, Bloomfield Theological Seminary, Bloomfield, N. J.; Ph.D. (University of Pennsylvania, 1894); D.D. (German Theological School of Newark, N. J., 1909).

* Sustaining Member.

Weis, Frederick Lewis, Unitarian, Rev.; Pastor of the Third Religious Society in Dorchester, Mass.; Ensign, Lieutenant, U. S. N., Retired; B.D. (Meadville Theological School, 1922).

Weiskotten, Herbert T., Lutheran, Rev.; Pastor of the English Lutheran Church of the Redeemer, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Ph.D. (Princeton University, 1918).

Wenner, George Unangst, Lutheran, Rev.; Pastor of Christ Church, Manhattan, New York; D.D. (Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, 1888); L.H.D. (Susquehanna University, 1917).

Wentz, Abdel Ross, Lutheran, Rev.; Professor of Church History at the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.; A.M. (Pennsylvania College, 1907): Ph.D. (George Washington University, 1914).

Weswig, Carl Marcus, Lutheran, Rev.: Professor of Historical Theology, Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul, Minn.; B.D. (Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary, 1898); D.D. (St. Olaf College, 1925).

Wilbur, Earl Morse, Unitarian, Rev.; President and Professor of Practical Theology, Pacific Unitarian School for the Ministry, Berkeley, Calif.; A.M. (Harvard University, 1890); D.D. (University of Vermont, 1910).

Willard, James Field; Professor of History in the University of Colorado, Boulder, Col.; Ph.D. (University of Pennsylvania, 1902).

Wishart, John Elliott, Presbyterian, Rev.; Professor of Systematic Theology, San Francisco Theological Seminary San Anselmo, Cal.; D.D. (Monmouth College, 1905); LL.D. (*ibid.*, 1922).

Worcester, Edward Strong, Reformed, Rev.; Professor of Systematic Theology in the New Brunswick Theological Seminary, New Brunswick, N. J.; B.D. (Hartford Theological Seminary, 1901); D.D. (Rutgers University, 1924).

II Library Members

Archives of the Moravian Church, Bethlehem, Pa.

Auburn Theological Seminary Library, Auburn, N. Y.

Brown University Library, Providence, R. I.

Carleton College Library, Northfield, Minn.

Eden Theological Seminary Library, Webster Groves, Mo.

Garrett Biblical Institute Library, Evanston, Ill

General Theological Seminary Library, Chelsea Sq., New York.

Grand Rapids Public Library, Grand Rapids, Mich.

McCormick Theological Seminary Library, Chicago, Ill.

New York Public Library, New York City, N. Y.

Princeton Theological Seminary Library, Princeton, N. J.

Public Library of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Slocum Library, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio.

Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary Library, Seminary Hill, Texas.

Union Theological Seminary Library, 3041 Broadway, New York.

University of Texas Library, Austin, Texas.

Vassar College Library, Poughkeepsie, New York.

DECEASED MEMBERS

ALLEN, ALEXANDER VIETS GRISWOLD, died at Cambridge, Mass., Wednesday, July 1, 1908.

BACON, LEONARD WOOLSEY, died at Assonet, Mass., Sunday, May 12, 1907.

BALLANTYNE, JAMES, died at Toronto, Canada, Wednesday, December 21, 1921.

BUCKLEY, JAMES MUNROE, died at Morristown, N. J., Sunday, February 8, 1920.

CARR, JOHN ARCHBALD, died September 16, 1920.

CASE, CLIFFORD PHILIP, died at Poughkeepsie, N. Y., Sunday, March 7, 1920.

CHRISTIAN, JOHN TYLER, died Friday, December 18, 1925.

COE, EDWARD BENTON, died at New York City, Thursday, March 19, 1914.

CORWIN, EDWARD TANJORE, died at North Branch, N. J., Monday, June 22, 1914.

DOSKER, HENRY ELIAS, died at Louisville, Ky., on Thursday, December 23, 1926.

DRYER, GEORGE HERBERT, died at Phoenix, Arizona, November 9, 1917.

DRURY, JOHN BENJAMIN, died at New Brunswick, N. J., Sunday, March 21, 1909.

DWIGHT, HENRY OTIS, died at Roselle, N. J., Tuesday, June 19, 1917.

ELWELL, JOHN LEWIS, died at Washington, D. C., Wednesday, March 16, 1910.

FERGUSON, HENRY, died at Hartford, Conn., Friday, March 30, 1917.

FERREE, BARR, died at Demarest, N. J., Tuesday, October 14, 1924.

FORSANDER, NILS, died at Moline, Ill., on Saturday, August 21, 1926.

FUNK, HENRY DANIEL, died at St. Paul, Minn., Tuesday, June 2, 1925.

GOOD, JAMES ISAAC, died at Philadelphia, Pa., Tuesday, January 22, 1924.

GOTWALD, FREDERICK GEBHART, died at Harrisburg, Pa., on Thursday, February 4, 1926.

HORR, GEORGE EDWIN, died at Newton, Mass., Saturday, January 22, 1927.

HULBERT, ERI BAKER, died at Chicago, Ill., Sunday, February 17, 1907.

JACKSON, GEORGE ANSON, died at Swampscott, Mass., Wednesday, May 8, 1907.

JACKSON, SAMUEL MACAULEY, died at Washington, Conn., Friday, August 2, 1912.

JOHNSON, EDWARD PAYSON, died at New Brunswick, N. J., Saturday, May 21, 1924.

KOLYN, MATTHEW, died at Muskegon, Mich., on May 3, 1918.

KROTEL, GOTTLOB FREDERICK, died at New York City, Friday, May 17, 1907.

LARSEN, LAURITZ, died at Erie, Pa., Sunday, January 28, 1923.

LEA, HENRY CHARLES, died at Philadelphia, Pa., Sunday, October 24, 1909.

LEWIS, ABRAM HERBERT, died at Westerly, R. I., Tuesday, November 3, 1908.

NEELY, THOMAS BENJAMIN, died at Philadelphia, Pa., Friday, September 4, 1925.

NICUM, JOHN, died at Rochester, N. Y., Monday, November 1, 1909.

NORCROSS, GEORGE, died at Carlisle, Pa., Monday, March 8, 1915.

O'Connel, Dennis Joseph, died at Richmond, Va., Saturday, January 1, 1927.

Rauschenbush, Walter, died at Rochester, N. Y., July 25, 1918.

Reed, Richard Clark, died at Columbia, S. C., Thursday, July 9, 1925.

Riggs, James Forsyth, died at Orange, N. J., January 24, 1918.

Rogers, James William, died at Walton, Ky., 1910.

Ruston, William Otis, died at Dubuque, Ia., Saturday, May 27, 1922.

Schoenfeld, William F., died on Wednesday, July 30, 1919.

Scott, Hugh McDonald, died at Chicago, Ill., Thursday, April 29, 1909.

Show, Arley Barthlow, died Wednesday, October 27, 1920.

Smith, Heman C., died at Independence, Mo., Thursday, April 17, 1919.

Spaeth, (Philip Friedrich) Adolph (Theodor), died at Philadelphia, Pa., Sunday, June 26, 1910.

Spieker, George Frederick, died at Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia, Pa., Sunday, September 7, 1913.

Stauffer, Vernon, died at Lexington, Ky., Wednesday, July 15, 1925.

Stephens, Henry Morse, died at San Francisco, Cal., April 16, 1919.

Thomas, Allen Clapp, died at Haverford, Pa., Wednesday, December 15, 1920.

Tiffany, Charles Comfort, died at Northeast Harbor, Me., Tuesday, August 20, 1907.

Van Kirk, Hiram, died at Noroton, Conn., Friday, August 13, 1920.

Walker, Henry Hammond, died at Manistee, Mich., Friday, September 2, 1927.

WALKER, WILLISTON, died at New Haven, Conn., Thursday, March 9, 1922.

WHITAKER, WILLIAM FORCE, died at Elizabeth, N. J., Sunday, July 9, 1916.

WRIGHT, HENRY BURR, died Thursday, December 27, 1923.

Statistics of Membership

	Living	Deceased
1908 (Vol. I)	61	4
1910 (Vol. II)	6c	14
1912 (Vol. III)	90	35
1914 (Vo. IV)	117[1]	18
1916 — —	144[2]	20
1917 (Vol. V)	159[2]	22
1921 (Vol. VI)	204[3]	34
1923 (Vol. VII)	178[4]	39
1927 (Vol. VIII)	201[5]	54

[1] Including three Libraries.
[2] Including five Libraries.
[3] Including eleven Libraries.
[4] Including twelve Libraries.
[5] Including seventeen Libraries.

BOOK TO BE RETURNED

270.06
A512

American society of church history.
AUTHOR

Papers. 2nd series, v. 8.
TITLE

27089

Date Due | Borrower's Name

270.06
A512 American society of church history.
Papers. 2nd series, v. 8.

27089